

# SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

## **Final Program Environmental Assessment for:**

### **Re-adoption of Proposed Rule 1315 – Federal New Source Review Tracking System**

## **VOLUME II: *Chapter 5***

January 7, 2011

SCAQMD No. 100909MKSS

State Clearinghouse No. 2009031044

### **Executive Officer**

Barry R. Wallerstein, D.Env.

### **Deputy Executive Officer**

#### **Planning, Rule Development and Area Sources**

Elaine Chang, DrPH

### **Assistant Deputy Executive Officer**

#### **Planning, Rule Development and Area Sources**

Laki Tisopulos, Ph.D., P.E.

### **Planning and Rules Manager**

Susan Nakamura

---

#### Author:

Michael Krause      Program Supervisor  
Steve Smith, Ph.D.   Program Supervisor  
ICF Jones & Stokes

#### Technical Assistance:

Jillian Baker      Air Quality Specialist  
Joe Cassmassi      Planning and Rules Manager  
Ali Ghasemi      Program Supervisor  
Mitch Haimov      Air Quality Analysis and Compliance  
Supervisor  
George Illes      Senior Air Quality Engineer  
Jeffrey Inabinet      Air Quality Specialist  
Bong-Mann Kim      Air Quality Specialist  
Xinqiu Zhang      Air Quality Specialist

**SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT  
GOVERNING BOARD**

**CHAIRMAN:** WILLIAM A. BURKE, Ed.D.  
Speaker of the Assembly Appointee

**VICE CHAIR:** DENNIS YATES  
Mayor, City of Chino  
Cities Representative, San Bernardino County

**MEMBERS:**

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
Los Angeles County Representative

JOHN BENOIT  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
Riverside County Representative

MICHAEL A. CACCIOTTI  
Councilmember, City of South Pasadena  
Cities of Los Angeles County, Eastern Region

BILL CAMPBELL  
Supervisor, Third District  
Orange County Representative

JANE CARNEY  
Senate Rules Committee Appointee

JOSIE GONZALES  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
San Bernardino County Representative

RONALD O. LOVERIDGE  
Mayor, City of Riverside  
Cities Representative, Riverside County

JOSEPH K. LYOU, Ph.D.  
Governor's Appointee

JUDY MITCHELL  
Councilmember, Rolling Hills Estates  
Cities of Los Angeles County, Western Region

JAN PERRY  
Councilwoman, 9<sup>th</sup> District  
City of Los Angeles Representative

MIGUEL A. PULIDO  
Mayor, City of Santa Ana  
Cities Representative, Orange County

**EXECUTIVE OFFICER:**  
BARRY R. WALLERSTEIN, D.Env.

## **CHAPTER 5**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Methodology**

**Aesthetics**

**Agricultural Resources**

**Air Quality**

**Biological Resources**

**Cultural Resources**

**Energy**

**Geology and Soils**

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

**Land Use and Planning**

**Mineral Resources**

**Noise**

**Population and Housing**

**Public Services**

**Recreation**

**Solid/Hazardous Waste**

**Transportation/Traffic**

**Consistency**

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.0**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - METHODOLOGY**

**Introduction**

**Methodology for Analysis of Environmental Impacts Related to Facility  
Construction and Operation**

**Existing and New Facilities**

**Mapping of Known Historic Permitted and Pending Facility Locations**

## **INTRODUCTION**

CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(a) requires environmental documents to identify significant environmental effects that may result from a proposed project. Significant effects of a project on the environment should be identified and described, with consideration given to both short- and long-term impacts. The discussion of environmental impacts may include, but is not limited to, the resources involved; physical changes; alterations of ecological systems; health and safety problems caused by physical changes; and other aspects of the resource base, including water, scenic quality, and public services.

The following sections describe the methodology used to identify the types of future facilities potentially affected by the proposed project, grouping like categories of facilities, and the process of identifying potential indirect impacts from construction and operation of representative facilities in each category of facilities. The analyses of potential adverse environmental impacts for each environmental topic area affected by the proposed project are located in the following subchapters.

The proposed project would establish regulatory procedures for making annual demonstrations of equivalency with federal emission offset requirements. The proposed project also proposes to establish the types of emission reductions, including newly-used reductions, eligible to offset emission increases. Accordingly, the direct adverse environmental impacts, air quality, visibility and greenhouse gas emissions, identified for the proposed project are discussed in Chapter 4. However, because providing offsets can be a critical step in obtaining approval to site a facility, the proposed offset accounting system has the potential to create indirect adverse environmental impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts under Rules 1304 and 1309.1. Depending upon the nature of the specific project and its setting, future affected facilities could require constructing new or modifying structures resulting in adverse impacts to a number of different environmental topic areas, as identified in the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project. As discussed earlier, topic areas that were initially found to be less-than-significant, or were found to have no impact, are also included for analysis. This subchapter summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential indirect impacts due to construction and operation of future new facilities.

As discussed in Chapter 4, Subchapter 4.0, this PEA uses a baseline for the direct air quality impacts which compares conditions with the project to conditions without the project. In both cases, the air quality will improve over future years, due to control measures already adopted and to be adopted in the future by the SCAQMD, CARB, and EPA. The PEA analysis looks at how much better conditions might be if the project were not implemented, rather than comparing conditions as of the day the NOP was issued to conditions under the project.

Chapter 5 looks at the indirect impacts of the project, which are the impacts of construction and operation of facilities receiving permits in reliance on the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts pursuant to the project. These impacts include water quality and demand, hazards, noise, impact on cultural and biological resources, etc. Most of these impacts would occur as a result of new facilities being constructed or the expansion of existing facilities. Accordingly, the more typical CEQA baseline is more appropriate. Thus, for this Chapter, the baseline is the "environmental setting", or the "physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published." (CEQA Guidelines §15125(a). As stated in the Guidelines, "this environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant." (Id.) Therefore, impacts in this Chapter are evaluated by comparing conditions with the project to conditions in the event the setting was undeveloped property.

## **METHODOLOGY FOR ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATED TO FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION**

The proposed project consists of adopting a revised version of proposed Rule 1315. A large number and a wide range of different types of pending and potential future facilities that require stationary source permits could receive permits pursuant to the proposed project. The indirect environmental impact analyses for the environmental categories other than air quality, visibility and greenhouse gas impacts are discussed in Subchapters 5.1 through 5.17 and address the potential future indirect district-wide environmental effects from future individual facilities that are exempt from offsets pursuant to Rule 1304 or that receive offsets from the Priority Reserve pursuant to Rule 1309.1 on a programmatic level as permitted by CEQA<sup>1</sup>.

Given the large number and variety of facilities and geographic extremes within the 10,473 square-mile area under SCAQMD jurisdiction, it is infeasible to analyze, in detail, the environmental impacts of each pending and potential future permitted facility. Therefore, general facility categories are identified based on the available historical data from facilities that have been permitted or with permits pending during a five-year period (2003 through 2008). Based upon these facility categories, a wide selection of corresponding CEQA documentation was examined for projects that would generally fit within each of these facility categories. These selected sample CEQA documents capture the range of reasonably foreseeable significant impacts that could occur as a result of siting, constructing, and operating facilities that could receive future emission offsets under the proposed rule.

The steps for identifying primary facility categories, review of past CEQA environmental documentation, and potential future environmental impacts are presented, in the following order:

---

<sup>1</sup> Cal. Code Reg. Title 14 §15168

1. Review of available existing data of past and pending permits (years 2003 through 2008) to identify the types of facilities that have or would have access to offsets pursuant to existing Rules 1304 and 1309.1 or would have had access to permits under Rule 1309.2<sup>2</sup> if it were in effect;
2. Identification of primary facility categories based upon review of permit data, with the number and representative percentages of facilities within the total permit database evaluated;
3. Review of CEQA documents relevant to each of the facility categories in order to determine the general characteristics of projects within each category;
4. Disclosure of potentially significant environmental impacts found in the analysis of past CEQA documents within each facility category, and the identification of significant impacts that could potentially occur for similar future projects.

Each of these steps is described in further detail below.

### **1) Review of Available Existing Data of Past and Pending Permits**

To analyze potential future reasonably foreseeable indirect impacts from the proposed project, it was first necessary to review past permits and pending permit applications to develop a master list of facility categories. Using this process to develop a master list provided a broadly inclusive selection of the different types of SCAQMD permit-related activities during a five-year period, as described in the following subsections.

Review of the SCAQMD's permit database produced a list of permits issued and pending by the SCAQMD under Rules 1304 and 1309.1 between 2003 and 2008. Approved and pending permits between 2002 and 2006 were also reviewed to identify facilities that would have qualified for offsets under Rule 1309.2, were it in effect. The list included 12,315 permits approved and pending between 2003 and 2008. A comprehensive evaluation of the database identified approximately 7,732 individual facilities located throughout the district that had obtained permits from the SCAQMD during this period. These 7,732 facilities represent a wide array of different commercial, institutional, transportation, and industrial uses, and are presented in Appendix E.

### **2) Identifying Facility Categories**

To group facilities into broad categories for analysis of environmental impacts, facilities were categorized according to their associated standardized North American Industrial

---

<sup>2</sup> Proposed amended Rule 1309.2 is no longer part of the proposed project. Rule 1309.2 was rescinded on February 5, 2010. Accordingly, the analysis includes some facilities that would no longer be eligible for SCAQMD internal accounts offsets. In view of the wide variety of sources that may be eligible for an exemption from offsets pursuant to Rule 1304, the analysis is still considered representative of potential future conditions.

Category System (NAICS)<sup>3</sup> code as available. For each facility, each assigned NAICS code (if available) consisted of a 6-digit numeric sequence, whereby the first two digits indicated the general economic activity of the facility. Each of the additional digits provided further refined detail specific to the business activities of that facility. Based upon careful review of the permit database, including the NAICS codes, the facilities were grouped according to the following general categories:

- agriculture facilities
- retail and service facilities
- large commercial facilities,
- entertainment and recreational facilities
- institutional facilities
- transportation facilities
- utilities, including power plant facilities
- light industrial and warehousing facilities
- heavy industrial facilities

**Number and Percentage of Facilities in Each Primary Facility Category**

Review of the database indicated that the total number of categorized facilities is approximately 6,230, which is based on the available NAICS codes for the known individual permitted facilities from the last five years (Table 5.0-1) (for more detail, see Appendix E). The remaining 1,502 facilities (out of 7,732) in the database were not categorized because NAICS codes for those facilities were not available. Furthermore, the full list of permitted and pending permits was manually reviewed in order to ensure accurate categorization of the wide variety of different facility types within each category.

**TABLE 5.0-1**

Number and Percentage of Permitted Facilities by Category (Years 2003 Through 2008)

| Primary Facility Categories <sup>a</sup> | Number of Permitted Facilities | Percentage of Total Number of Facilities | Average Number of Permits Approved per Year | Number of Newly Sited Facilities per Year <sup>b</sup> |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Agricultural Facilities                  | 14                             | < 1.0%                                   | 3   | <1   |
| Retail/Services Facilities               | 2,621                          | 42.1%                                    | 524   | 26   |
| Large Commercial Facilities              | 649                            | 10.4%                                    | 130   | 6  |
| Entertainment/Recreational Facilities    | 24                             | < 1.0%                                   | 5   | <1   |

<sup>3</sup> United States Census Bureau. 2009. North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS). Online at <http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/>. Referenced permitted facility NAICS codes provided by SCAQMD socioeconomics staff, May 28, 2009.

**TABLE 5.0-1 (Concluded)**

Number and Percentage of Permitted Facilities by Category (Years 2003 Through 2008)

| Primary Facility Categories <sup>a</sup> | Number of Permitted Facilities | Percentage of Total Number of Facilities | Average Number of Permits Approved per Year | Number of Newly Sited Facilities per Year <sup>b</sup> |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Institutional Facilities                 | 421                            | 6.8%                                     | 84  | 4  |
| Transportation Facilities                | 100                            | 1.6%                                     | 20  | 1  |
| Utility Projects (Includes Power Plants) | 150                            | 2.4%                                     | 30  | 2  |
| Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities    | 1,133                          | 18.2%                                    | 227   | 11   |
| Heavy Industrial Facilities              | 1,118                          | 17.9                                     | 224   | 11   |
| <b>Total</b>                             | <b>6,230<sup>c</sup></b>       | <b>100<sup>d</sup></b>                   | <b>1,247</b>                                | <b>63<sup>d</sup></b>                                  |

<sup>a</sup> Based upon United State Census Bureau, 2009. North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS).

<sup>b</sup> Based on Small Business Administration data (2009) (See Table 5.0-3); New facilities = number of permits per year x 0.05

<sup>c</sup> The total number of individual facilities permitted within the last 5 years is 7,732. However, NAICS codes were available for only 6,230 of these facilities (SCAQMD, May 29, 2009).

<sup>d</sup> Total affected by rounding.

Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009

### 3) Review of CEQA Documents and Facility Category Descriptions

Once the survey of the SCAQMD’s permit database was completed and primary facility categories were identified based on NAICS codes, historical permit data were further reviewed to identify the basic characteristics for each primary facility. In addition, to provide a more robust analysis of potential adverse environmental impacts from implementing the proposed project, project-specific CEQA documents for facilities illustrative of each primary facility category were reviewed to identify environmental resources that may be adversely affected by facilities in each primary facility category.

#### Selection of Available CEQA Documents

The CEQA documents were selected for review based upon a number of factors. Initially, documents that were prepared or approved by SCAQMD were examined. Documents for projects that were reviewed by SCAQMD were also collected. However, there were insufficient documents to provide an adequate representation of projects across the different facility categories. Accordingly, additional CEQA documents were reviewed as listed by the State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit within the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, and as found to be available from other public agency

sources. The available CEQA documents were screened according to their applicability to each respective facility category.

The CEQA documents were selected based upon availability, within their respective facility categories, for the sole purpose of illustrating the *types of impacts* that would be likely to result from the development of projects within each of the different general facility categories. The CEQA documents selected reflect projects currently or recently occurring for the different primary facility categories analyzed for potential indirect impacts from the proposed project. Equipment operated at these types of facilities could be eligible for offsets through Rule 1304(d) exemptions or Rule 1309.1 Priority Reserve. The CEQA analysis in the documents selected is based on the project as a whole and not just the permitted equipment eligible for offsets under the proposed project. Thus, the impacts from the CEQA analyses surveyed are not limited to the impacts from the affected equipment that will receive the offsets pursuant to Rule 1304 or 1309.1, but would reflect the impacts from the entire project.

It should be noted that these CEQA documents represent a snapshot of impacts that could be generated by future projects affected by the proposed project. A number of small projects often are not required to undergo project-specific environmental review e.g., gas stations, dry cleaners, restaurants, auto-body shops, etc.), particularly those future affected projects or operations that are located in pre-existing facilities. Further, the future contextual location and project-specific characteristics may be unique to individual projects.

Nonetheless, to the extent data were available, each facility category surveyed provided an analysis for the proposed project commensurate with the level of analysis appropriate for programmatic CEQA documents. Since it is not possible to know exactly what future permits will be approved, the analysis represents the best available information. The CEQA documents evaluated are listed in Table 5.0-2 below.

**Facility Category Descriptions**

General descriptions of each primary facility category are provided below, according to information obtained from the CEQA documents listed in Table 5.0-2 below.

**TABLE 5.0-2**

CEQA Documents Reviewed For Each Primary Facility Category

| Facility Category         | CEQA Documents  |
|---------------------------|---|
| Agricultural Facilities   | 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR<br>2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR   |
| Retail/Service Facilities | 3. Medical Office ND in Long Beach<br>4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR<br>5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR |

**TABLE 5.0-2**  
**CEQA Documents Reviewed For Each Primary Facility Category**

| Facility Category                            | CEQA Documents   |
|--|--|
|  | 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR<br>7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR<br>8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR<br>9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR<br>10. New Century Plan EIR  |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>           | 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel EIR<br>12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR<br>13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR<br>14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR<br>15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR<br>16. Panorama Palace Project EIR<br>17. Metro Universal Project EIR<br>18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR<br>19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR   |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b> | 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR<br>21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR<br>22. Canyon Hills Project EIR<br>23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR  |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>              | 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR<br>25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR<br>26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR<br>27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR<br>28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR<br>29. New Paradise Church Project EIR<br>30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR<br>31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR<br>32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR<br>33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR<br>34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR<br>35. West LA College EIR<br>36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.<br>37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR<br>38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>             | 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR<br>40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR<br>41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR   |

**TABLE 5.0-2**  
**CEQA Documents Reviewed For Each Primary Facility Category**

| Facility Category                            | CEQA Documents   |
|--|--|
| <b>Utilities (Includes Power Plants)</b>     | 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved) - Improved Power Generating Facility<br>43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR<br>44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR<br>45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b> | 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR<br>47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR<br>48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR<br>49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR  |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>           | 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR<br>51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR<br>52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.  |

Sources: California State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, 2009; SCAQMD, 2009

*Agricultural Facilities*

Pending and potential future agricultural facilities that require stationary source permits and could receive emissions offsets pursuant to the proposed project include establishments such as dairies, ranches, wineries, and the production of various agricultural crops. Various building structures, such as farm and engine equipment operation, and agricultural crops are associated with agricultural land uses. Physical structures for these facilities are typically industrial warehouse-type buildings, located in rural, open space, and agricultural areas. Typical permitted stationary source equipment used at these facilities includes diesel and gasoline backup generators and gasoline storage and dispensing equipment.

*Retail/Service Facilities*

Pending and potential future permit applications for retail/service facilities that would require stationary source permits and could receive emissions offsets pursuant to the proposed project include various consumer products, food and beverage retail stores, restaurants, gas stations, auto repair, dry cleaning, and miscellaneous consumer retail establishments. Based on the analysis of permit applications for this category of facility, permitted stationary source equipment includes backup generators; service station gasoline storage and dispensing equipment; dry cleaning equipment; printing presses; boilers; paint spray booths; and food frying, charbroiling, and other cooking equipment.

*Large Commercial Facilities*

Pending and potential permit applications for future large commercial facilities that would require stationary source permits and could receive emissions offsets pursuant to the proposed project include various professional (financial, legal, and business consulting), technical (telecommunications, research), hospitality, and large-scale retail services. These facilities are typically located in large office buildings or mixed-use developments in commercially zoned, developed urban areas. Based on the analysis of permit applications for this category of facility, permitted stationary source equipment includes backup generators and boilers.

*Entertainment/Recreational facilities*

Pending and potential permit applications for future entertainment/recreation facilities that would require stationary source permits and could receive emissions offsets pursuant to the proposed project include aquariums, zoos, amusement and theme parks, golf courses, stadiums, casinos, health clubs, and some commercial entertainment districts and facilities. These facilities are located in a variety of mixed-use, commercial, open space, and residential areas. Based on the analysis of permit applications for this category of facility, permitted stationary source equipment includes backup generating equipment, cooking equipment (e.g., ovens, fryers, grills, etc.), pumps, and boilers.

*Institutional Facilities*

Pending and potential permit applications for future institutional facilities that would require stationary source permits and could receive emissions offsets pursuant to the proposed rule include elementary, middle, and high schools, as well as community colleges, universities and other educational facilities; churches and religious structures; health care facilities, including medical offices, hospitals, and clinics; and various government offices. These facilities are located in commercial, residential, and mixed-use areas. Based on the analysis of permit applications for this category of facilities, permitted stationary source equipment includes backup generating equipment, gasoline storage and dispensing equipment, and boilers.

*Transportation Facilities*

Pending and potential permit applications for future transportation facilities that would require stationary source permits and could receive emissions offsets pursuant to the proposed project include seaports and airports, rail yards, shipping terminals, passenger service facilities, and road and highway construction and maintenance facilities. These facilities are located and surrounded by industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-related areas. Based on the analysis of permit applications for this category of facility, permitted stationary source equipment includes generators and fuel storage and distribution facilities.

*Utility Projects including Power Plant Facilities*

Pending and potential permit applications for future utility projects that would require stationary source permits and could receive emissions offsets pursuant to the proposed project include power generating facilities if eligible for exemption under Rule 1304, water and wastewater treatment plants, and solid waste recycling and transfer facilities. These facilities are often located in heavy industrial areas. Based on the analysis of permit applications for this category of facility, permitted stationary source equipment includes large-scale diesel, natural gas, and other fossil fuel powered electrical generation equipment, boilers, and incinerators (to the extent such equipment meets the exemption requirements in Rule 1304).

*Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities*

Pending and potential permit applications for future light industrial/warehouse projects that would require stationary source permits and could receive emissions offsets pursuant to the proposed project include media and studio production facilities; business parks; merchant wholesale operations; light manufacturing; printing and paper production; and various specialty trade contractors such as custom furniture shops, industrial artists, and hardware and building material suppliers. These facilities typically are located in low-scale, one- to two-story warehouse buildings and are typically located in light industrial, commercial, or studio district land use areas. Based on the analysis of permit applications for this category of facility, permitted stationary source equipment includes backup generators, paint spray booths, furnaces, metal coating and treatment equipment, boilers, storage tanks, and printing presses.

*Heavy Industrial Facilities*

Review of existing and pending permits over the last five years indicated that heavy industrial facilities that would require stationary source permits and could receive emission offsets if eligible for exemption under Rule 1304 include oil refineries, chemical plants, steel foundries and metal fabrication, machinery and heavy equipment manufacturing, electronics manufacturing, building construction materials, and mining and oil and gas extraction. Due to the scale of operation, these facilities may be of substantial size. These facilities are primarily located in areas zoned for industrial uses. Based on the analysis of permit applications for this category of facility, permitted stationary source equipment includes boilers, furnaces and drying ovens, oil refining processes, solvent and chemical production, electronic soldering equipment, chemical storage tanks, concrete batch equipment, and abrasive blasting equipment (to the extent such equipment meets the exemption requirements in Rule 1304).

**4) Assessment of Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts**

Because the SCAQMD is forecasting the nature and characteristics of future facilities based on historical permit data and information from previously prepared CEQA documents, detailed quantification of such impacts is not possible because the nature and characteristics of the specific facilities that may be constructed and operated in the future are currently not known.

The determination of impacts resulting from a particular facility category is dependent upon known information about that facility category. Types of available facility information ascertained include general physical characteristics, such as building size, footprint, height, mass, and the proximity of the facilities to sensitive receptors and visual resources, as well as operational and physical characteristics described in the selected available environmental documentation for each of the facility categories (see Table 5.0-2). Based upon the historical data of permitted facilities over the five-year period, and the impacts typically generated within each of these facility categories, it is possible to qualitatively evaluate the potential significant impacts that may occur for each category. Qualitative descriptions of the types of impacts that may occur are provided, according to the available information from the selected CEQA documents. Furthermore, a summary of the determination of significance for each environmental impact area disclosed within the CEQA documents is presented in the following subchapters in Chapter 5.

It should be noted that all future projects would require environmental documentation as deemed appropriate by the relevant lead agency, which will be responsible for the determination of significant impacts and for ensuring implementation of all appropriate mitigation measures.

## **EXISTING AND NEW FACILITIES**

While environmental impacts may occur as a result of constructing individual facilities under the proposed project, not all emissions offsets provided by the SCAQMD to eligible facilities would result in the construction of new facilities. Based upon the available permit database, it was not possible to determine whether a permit was issued for a facility in an existing structure or newly constructed facility. However, it is likely that a large majority of permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities, as explained below. Many small businesses, such as dry cleaners, automotive repair shops, and restaurants, occupy existing, established buildings in previously developed commercial centers. Furthermore, existing facilities that receive new equipment-specific permits would not necessarily generate the same types of indirect impacts as newly constructed facilities. Existing facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD have the potential to generate both construction and operational air quality impacts, but because the physical characteristics of the overall facility are unlikely to change, indirect impacts to other environmental topic areas would not be expected or would be expected to be less than the indirect impacts for new facilities.

Nonetheless, in order to ensure an inclusive and conservative approach, the impact analysis in this PEA assumes that permits granted under the proposed project for each primary facility category would result in construction of new facilities.

According to the Small Business Administration (SBA)<sup>4</sup>, during the 2001, 2003, and 2004 U.S. Census years<sup>5</sup>, the SCAQMD region, including the Metropolitan Statistical Areas of Los Angeles, Long Beach, Santa Ana (LA-LB-SA) and Riverside, San Bernardino, Orange (R-SB-O), had an annual weighted average new business establishment rate of approximately 14 percent and an annual weighted average 12 percent rate of so-called ‘dead’ or non-functional business establishments (that have gone out of business), as shown below. It is reasonable to expect that similar rates of business starts and closures will continue in the future. However, these averages do not indicate the specific types of new or existing businesses, or provide a clear indication of potential reuse of existing buildings vacated by ‘dead’ businesses. They also do not account for current or changing economic conditions after 2004 that may affect the rate of new or dead establishments. Therefore, these average numbers provide only an estimate of the number of new businesses each year – approximately 14 percent (Table 5.0-3).

**TABLE 5.0-3**

Historical Information on New Versus “Dead” Businesses

| Year   | Region    | Total Establishments<br>(number) | New Establishments |            | Dead Establishments |            |
|--|-----------|----------------------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|
|  |           |                                  | number             | percent    | number              | percent    |
| 2001   | LA-LB-SA* | 197,940                          | 27,544             | 14%        | 25,159              | 13%        |
| 2001   | R-SB-O**  | 48,611                           | 7,677              | 16%        | 5,813               | 12%        |
| 2003   | LA-LB-SA  | 276,168                          | 36,438             | 13%        | 32,030              | 12%        |
| 2003   | R-SB-O    | 52,529                           | 7,330              | 14%        | 6,142               | 12%        |
| 2004   | LA-LB-SA  | 280,360                          | 37,680             | 13%        | 32,385              | 12%        |
| 2004   | R-SB-O    | 53,718                           | 8,261              | 15%        | 6,156               | 11%        |
| <b>Weighted Average (2001, 2003, &amp; 2004)</b> |           |                                  |                    | <b>14%</b> |                     | <b>12%</b> |

Source: SBA, 2009

<sup>4</sup> According to the Small Business Administration, a small business is defined as an independent business having fewer than 500 employees. Nationwide, small businesses represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms, employ about half of all private sector employees, and pay nearly 45 percent of total U.S. private payroll (SBA, 2009).

<sup>5</sup> 2002 data was not available from the Small Business Administration.

## **MAPPING OF KNOWN HISTORIC PERMITTED AND PENDING FACILITY LOCATIONS**

As a supplement to determining whether specific categories of facilities have historically resulted in significant impacts and for informational purposes in order to provide context and perspective to the reader, the locations of affected facilities or categories of facilities were mapped to determine their spatial distributions within the district. It may be assumed that future facilities would be spatially distributed in similar patterns to previous permitted facilities because commercial and industrial facilities can only be located in appropriately zoned areas. An individual map was created for each of the nine facility categories. The facility category location maps are presented in Appendix F.

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.1**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - AESTHETICS**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## INTRODUCTION

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, proposed Rule 1315 has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse visual impacts depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential indirect impacts of the proposed project on visual resources and views from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

Impacts on visibility from air pollutant emissions are addressed in Subchapter 4.1.

### Methodology

The methodology for determining the significance of potential aesthetics impacts is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed project in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse aesthetics impacts include assessments of impacts to designated scenic resources (such as scenic highways or vista points), visual character, and other aesthetic qualities that may be caused by future new projects. The following factors were considered in assessing the significance of impacts on visual resources and quality from future new projects within each of the facility categories:

*Scale* – the size, density, and compatibility of a facility relative to the existing surrounding area;

*Degree of visibility* – the extent to which a facility can be seen or noticed. To a large extent, this depends on the contextual placement of the facility in relation to the existing surrounding visual resources; and

*Visual Character* – the extent to which changes to an affected facility or construction of a new facility will degrade the existing landscape, scenic views, visual look or quality of the site and the surrounding area.

Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

## **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as “a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment” (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is “significant,” generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant aesthetics impacts if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.
- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential aesthetic impacts from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on scenic resources and visual character of a given area. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts to aesthetic resources is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Future new or modified facilities could potentially result in built form of a scale and mass that is inconsistent with adjoining development, that could remove trees or affect historic buildings, or that could obstruct regionally or locally important views. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse aesthetic impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

## Potential Aesthetics Impacts of Identified Facility Categories

### Agricultural Facilities

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to reevaluate existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future. On a programmatic level, impacts to visual resources as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include potentially altering undeveloped open space and natural areas, developing scenic hillsides (such as wineries), and/or obstructing views from scenic highways, including in rural or agriculturally zoned areas. Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to sensitive residential and publicly accessible scenic areas. The potential scale and height of farm structures, dairy processing plants, and other agricultural-related structures may result in significant visual and aesthetic impacts to surrounding non-agricultural land uses, scenic vistas, and scenic resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.1-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on aesthetics and visual quality, including changes in scenic views or vistas, changes to visual quality and character of the immediate project area, and increased lighting and nighttime illumination. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities may be of substantial size and mass, are typically constructed and operated within areas zoned for agriculture, are likely to be consistent with the existing visual character and land use of the surrounding area, and therefore, are unlikely to affect scenic views or other visual resources. Accordingly, these projects were found to have less-than-significant aesthetic impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

- a) Scenic Vistas.** One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures on scenic vistas; the other CEQA document

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.1-1**  
**Aesthetics Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documents**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                     |                     |                                  |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       | N – No impacts                  |                     |                     |                                  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |                                 |                     |                     |                                  |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination      |                     |                     |                                  |
|  | a) Scenic Vista                 | b) Scenic Resources | c) Visual Character | d) Light or Glare                |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>                                   |                                 |                     |                     |                                  |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR                                    | LS                              | LS                  | LSM                 | LSM                              |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                               | NE                              | NE                  | LS                  | LS                               |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                |                                 |                     |                     |                                  |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                        | LS                              | N                   | LSM                 | LSM                              |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR                                  | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LSM                              |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                   | S                               | NE                  | LS                  | S                                |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                               | LS                              | NE                  | LS                  | LS<br>(shade/<br>shadow-S)       |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                    |                                 |                     | LS                  | LSM                              |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                | NE                              | NE                  | NE                  | LSM<br>(shade/<br>shadow-S)      |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                        | LS                              | NE                  | LS                  | LS                               |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                               |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                               |                                 |                     |                     |                                  |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel, Travelodge Hotel EIR                    | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                               |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR                                     | LS                              | LS                  | LSM                 | LSM                              |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR                                 | S                               | NE                  | NE                  | NE                               |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                 | LS                              | NE                  | LS                  | NE                               |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                               |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR                                  | LS                              | LS                  | S                   | S                                |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR                                  | LS                              | NE                  | S                   | S                                |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                            | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                               |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LSM<br>(shade/<br>shadows-<br>S) |

**TABLE 5.1-1 (Continued)**

**Aesthetics Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documents**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                     |                     |                   |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   | N – No impacts                  |                     |                     |                   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                                      |                                 |                     |                     |                   |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                 | Significance Determination      |                     |                     |                   |
|  | a) Scenic Vista                 | b) Scenic Resources | c) Visual Character | d) Light or Glare |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                                     |                                 |                     |                     |                   |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR                           | NE                              | NE                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR                               | S                               | LS                  | S                   | S                 |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR   | S                               | S                   | S                   | S                 |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                                | N                               | LS                  | LS                  | N                 |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>  |                                 |                     |                     |                   |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR   | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                                       | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                                     | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                                    | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LSM               |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR  | N                               | NE                  | S                   | LS                |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR  | NE                              | LS                  | LSM                 | LSM               |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR   | NE                              | LS                  | LSM                 | LSM               |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                                    | LS                              | NE                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR   | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR                            | LS                              | LS                  | S                   | NE                |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LSM               |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.                                    | LS                              | N                   | N                   | LS                |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | LS                              | NE                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR                               | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |                                 |                     |                     |                   |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR                              | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR | LS                              | NE                  | S                   | LS                |

**TABLE 5.1-1 (Concluded)**  
**Aesthetics Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documents**

| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                     |                     |                   |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                  |                     |                     |                   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |                                 |                     |                     |                   |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed  | Significance Determination      |                     |                     |                   |
|   | a) Scenic Vista                 | b) Scenic Resources | c) Visual Character | d) Light or Glare |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR   | LS                              | LSM                 | LSM                 | LSM               |
| <b>Utility Facilities</b>   |                                 |                     |                     |                   |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility  | LSM                             | N                   | LSM                 | LSM               |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR  | NE                              | NE                  | NE                  | NE                |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR   | S                               | NE                  | S                   | LSM               |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR   | S                               | NE                  | S                   | LS                |
| <b>Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities</b>  |                                 |                     |                     |                   |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | NE                              | LS                  | LS                  | LSM               |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LSM               |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LSM               |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |                                 |                     |                     |                   |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | NE                              | NE                  | NE                  | NE                |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LS                              | LS                  | LS                  | LS                |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N                               | N                   | LS                  | N                 |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |                                 |                     |                     |                   |

did not address impacts on scenic vistas. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic vistas. Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories

available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic vistas from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Scenic Resources.** One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact on scenic resources; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on scenic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Visual Character.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on the visual character of an area. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the visual character or quality of an area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Light and Glare.** Both of the CEQA documents surveyed for the agricultural facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on light and glare. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on light and glare.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on light and glare from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data, only some of these facilities would involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas. Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential for alteration of undeveloped open space and natural areas or obstruction of views from scenic highways or other scenic resources. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse aesthetic impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.1-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on aesthetics and visual quality, including changes in scenic views or vistas, changes to visual quality and character of the immediate project area, and increased lighting and nighttime illumination. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings, which were found to result in changes to the visual character of the immediate project area, obstruction of existing views, or require additional outdoor lighting. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts as most retail and service establishments surveyed are located in developed urban areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding visual quality and character, scenic resources, and existing lighting and nighttime illumination levels. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Scenic Vistas.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the retail/service facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts on scenic vistas were concluded to be less-than-significant. However, for some projects

surveyed, the lead agencies concluded that the retail/service facility category projects had the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on scenic vistas, such as those disclosed for the Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on scenic vistas from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Scenic Resources.** CEQA documents surveyed for the proposed project indicated that past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on scenic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Visual Character.** CEQA documents surveyed for the proposed project indicated that past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on the visual character of an area. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the visual character or quality of an area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on visual character from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Light and Glare.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the retail/service facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts related to light and glare and shade/shadow were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, for some

projects surveyed, the lead agencies concluded that the retail/service facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to illumination and shade/shadow (Table 5.1-1). More specifically, those projects that include parking lots and structures were found to result in significant impacts to light and glare, while those projects that involve multiple-story structures generally were found to generate significant impacts related to shade/shadow.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to light and glare and shade/shadow from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data, only some of these facilities were anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of undeveloped open space and natural areas or substantial new obstruction of views from scenic highways, or other scenic resources. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant aesthetic impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.1-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on aesthetics and visual quality, including changes in scenic views or vistas, changes to visual quality and character of the immediate project area, large electronic signage, and increased lighting and nighttime illumination. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found to result in changes to the visual character of the surrounding neighborhood, obstruction of existing views, additional outdoor lighting, commercial signage, and removal of existing landscaping and vegetation. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts since most of the commercial facilities are located in developed urban areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding visual quality and character, scenic

resources, and existing lighting and nighttime illumination levels. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Scenic Vistas.** CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts on scenic vistas were less-than-significant. However, for some projects surveyed, the lead agencies concluded that the large commercial facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on scenic vistas, such as those disclosed for the Travelodge Hotel Project in the City of Santa Monica.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on scenic vistas from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Scenic Resources.** CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on scenic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Visual Character.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts on the visual character of an area were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, for some projects surveyed (e.g., Projects #13 – Travelodge Hotel, #16 – Panorama Palace, #17 Metro Universal, and #19 – Plaza at the Glen), the lead agencies concluded that the large commercial facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on the visual character of an area due to the increase in height and massing on the project site and to the signage created by the specific project.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis

was prepared, impacts on visual character from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Light and Glare.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts related to light and glare and shade/shadow that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, for three of the projects surveyed, the lead agencies concluded that the large commercial facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to illumination and shade/shadow (Table 5.1-1). More specifically, the CEQA document for one project (Project # 16 – Panorama Palace) identified significant adverse impacts related to light due to the degree of increased illumination created by the project, and another CEQA document for a large commercial project (Project # 21 – Metro Universal) identified a significant adverse impact related to light due to the animated/moving signage created by the project. One project (Project # 19 – Plaza at the Glen) identified a significant impact related to shade/shadow.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to light and glare and shade/shadow from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, a small number of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities is anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to alter undeveloped open space and natural areas that may result in the obstruction or alteration of views from scenic highways or other significant impacts on scenic resources. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse aesthetic resources impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.1-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront

project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on aesthetics and visual quality, including changes to visual quality and character of the immediate project area, loss of vegetation, large signage, changes in scenic views or vistas, and increased lighting and nighttime illumination levels. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, outdoor lighting, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were determined to result in changes to the visual character within the surrounding neighborhood, obstruction of existing views, additional outdoor lighting, signage, and removal of existing vegetation. Accordingly, these projects were found to have significant aesthetic impacts. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Scenic Vistas.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that for some of the projects, no environmental impacts on scenic vistas would occur. However, for some projects surveyed, the lead agencies concluded that the entertainment/recreational facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on scenic vistas, such as those disclosed for the LA Live and Canyon Hills projects due to the obstruction of views of important architectural landmarks in an area and the substantial alteration of existing views of undeveloped hillsides from scenic highways, respectively.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on scenic vistas from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Scenic Resources.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that for three of the four projects surveyed, environmental impacts on scenic resources were less-than-significant. However, for one of the projects surveyed, the lead agency concluded that the entertainment/recreational facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on scenic resources, such as those disclosed for the Canyon Hills project due to the substantial alteration of major landforms and undisturbed native vegetation.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on scenic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Visual Character.** Review of environmental documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category that have or could have obtained

offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts on the visual character of an area were less-than-significant. However, for two of the four projects surveyed (e.g., Projects # 21 – LA Live and #22 – Canyon Hills), the lead agencies concluded that the entertainment/recreational facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on the visual character of an area due to the substantial alteration of undisturbed hillsides and the change in the rural ambience of an area into a developed community. In addition, significant impacts also were also found to result from the introduction of substantial signage to a primarily urban environment.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on visual character from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Light and Glare.** Environmental documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that for some of the projects, either environmental impacts related to light and glare were less-than-significant or no impact would occur. However, for two of the four projects surveyed (e.g., Projects # 21 – LA Live and #22 – Canyon Hills), the lead agencies concluded that the entertainment/recreational facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to illumination. More specifically, significant impacts related to lighting were found to result from a substantial increase in illumination in an area that currently experiences a low level of illumination and has a rural character or a substantial increase in illumination in a heavily developed area due to billboard washes and spot lighting, neon, incandescent lamps, searchlights, electronic billboards, special laser light shows, and light-emitting diode (LED) screens.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to light and glare from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities were anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Most of these facilities would be

constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and would, therefore, would have a low potential for alteration of undeveloped open space and natural areas or substantial new obstruction of views from scenic highways or other scenic resources. Therefore, these future facilities would have a low likelihood of resulting in significant aesthetic impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse aesthetic impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.1-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on aesthetics and visual quality, including changes to visual quality and character of the immediate project area, loss of vegetation, changes in scenic views or vistas, and increased lighting and nighttime illumination levels. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities, which were found to result in changes in the visual character within the surrounding neighborhood, obstruction of existing views, additional outdoor lighting, glare, and removal of existing vegetation. However, these projects were generally found to have less-than-significant aesthetic impacts as most of these projects are located in developed urban areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding resources and existing lighting and nighttime illumination levels. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Scenic Vistas.** Review of the CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category all disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic vistas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic vistas from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Scenic Resources.** CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category all disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on scenic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is

possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Visual Character.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the institutional facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts on the visual character of an area were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, for some projects surveyed (e.g., Projects # 28 – Museum of Tolerance and #34 – Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School), the lead agencies concluded that the institutional facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on the visual character of an area due to the degree of contrast between project features and the existing features on the project sites and the surrounding areas and the substantial increase in the overall mass and scale when compared with surrounding residential neighborhood.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on visual character from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Light and Glare.** CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category that have or could all disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures related to light and glare. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts related to light and glare.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation-Related Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to

continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting. However, any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of undeveloped open space and natural areas or substantial new obstruction of views from scenic highways or other scenic resources. Therefore, transportation facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant aesthetic impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts on aesthetics.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.1-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on aesthetics, including changes to visual quality and character of the immediate project area, changes in scenic views or vistas, and increased lighting and nighttime illumination. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, bus storage and maintenance facilities, and mixed-use residential and commercial facilities, some of which were found to result in changes to the visual character of the surrounding community, obstruction of existing views, additional outdoor lighting, glare, and removal of existing landscaping. However, the CEQA documents for the projects that were surveyed were found to have less-than-significant aesthetic impacts as most of these projects were located in developed mixed-use, industrial, and commercial zoned areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding visual resources and existing lighting and nighttime illumination levels. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Scenic Vistas.** CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category all disclosed less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas. However, the based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's

offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic vistas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic vistas from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Scenic Resources.** CEQA documents for that past projects in the transportation facility category all disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on scenic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Visual Character.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the transportation facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts on the visual character of an area were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, for some projects, the lead agencies concluded that the transportation facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on the visual character of an area, such as those disclosed for the Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project due to the degree of contrast between project elements and the existing features that embody the project area’s valued aesthetic image.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on visual character from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Light and Glare.** CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts all disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant

impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures related to light and glare. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts related to light and glare.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some types of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity and the distributed nature of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Although these facilities would typically be constructed in industrial zoned areas, these facilities may be sited near or directly adjacent to sensitive residential neighborhoods and publicly accessible scenic areas. The potential scale and height of exhaust structures, flares, and other functional components of a typical large scale industrial utility may result in visual impacts to surrounding non-industrial land uses. Accordingly, it is likely that a number of conflicts may occur regarding the surrounding visual quality and character, scenic resources, and existing lighting and nighttime illumination levels. Therefore, future construction and operation of utility facilities would likely generate significant adverse aesthetic impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.1-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on aesthetics, including changes to visual quality and character of the immediate project area, changes in scenic views or vistas, and increased lighting and nighttime illumination levels. Based

on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, could generate changes to the visual character of the surrounding neighborhood, obstruction of existing views, and additional outdoor lighting and glare. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Scenic Vistas.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the utility facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts on scenic vistas were less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, for some projects, the lead agencies concluded that the utility facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on scenic vistas, such as those disclosed for the landfill and recharge basin/pipeline projects due to the obstruction of scenic views of the mountains and Joshua trees/desert shrubs, respectively.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on scenic vistas from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Scenic Resources.** Three of the four CEQA documents for a past project in the utility facility category disclosed no impacts on scenic resources; the three remaining CEQA documents did not address impacts on scenic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Visual Character.** CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the utility facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts on the visual character of an area were less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, for some projects, the lead agencies concluded that the utility facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on visual quality, such as those disclosed for the landfill and recharge basin/pipeline projects. More specifically, the CEQA document for the landfill project concluded that the proposed project could obstruct views of the

mountains, and the recharge basin/pipeline project would result in the substantial alteration of the visual character of the project sites through the removal of Joshua tree woodland and other desert vegetation, creating the appearance of development encroaching into previously undisturbed land.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on visual character from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Light and Glare.** CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category all disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures related to light and glare. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts related to light and glare.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings that could require outdoor lighting and moderate amounts of construction activities, which may result in significant adverse visual impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.1-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have

on aesthetics, including changes to visual quality and character of the immediate project area, changes in scenic views or vistas, and increased lighting and nighttime illumination levels. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in changes in the visual character within the surrounding neighborhood, obstruction of existing views, additional outdoor lighting, glare, and removal of existing landscaping and vegetation. However, adverse effects were not found to be significant since most of these facilities were located in developed urban industrial areas and largely compatible with the surrounding visual resources and existing lighting and nighttime illumination levels. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of aesthetic impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Scenic Vistas.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic vistas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic vistas from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Scenic Resources.** Review of all three CEQA documents surveyed for the proposed project indicated that past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on scenic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Visual Character.** All three CEQA documents for the proposed project indicated that past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on the visual character of an area. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this

facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the visual character or quality of an area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the visual character of a neighborhood from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Light and Glare.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures related to light and glare. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts related to light and glare.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities were anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas. Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. These facilities typically require outdoor lighting, smoke stacks, flares, and other industrial structures – visual elements, which due to their long-range visibility, have the potential to affect existing views and visual quality of adjacent non-industrial areas. Accordingly, it is likely that these types of project would significantly impact the surrounding visual quality and character of a neighborhood, scenic resources, and existing lighting and nighttime illumination levels. Therefore, these future heavy industrial facilities have the potential of generating significant adverse aesthetic impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.1-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on aesthetics, including changes to visual quality and character of the immediate project area, changes in scenic views or vistas, and increased lighting and nighttime illumination levels. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could generate changes in the future visual character within the surrounding community, obstruction of existing views, additional outdoor lighting, glare, and removal of existing vegetation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of aesthetic impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Scenic Vistas.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category that have disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic vistas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic vistas from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Scenic Resources.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on scenic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on scenic resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on scenic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Visual Character.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on the visual

character of an area. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the visual character or quality of an area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the visual character of a neighborhood from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Light and Glare.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts related to light and glare. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts related to light and glare.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to aesthetics could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to aesthetics and visual resources that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documentation found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts on scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, light and glare, and shade/shadow.

Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, aesthetic impacts and impacts to visual resources as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other “past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects.” [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355]

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal credit accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal and accounts per SB 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez), proposed Senate Bill (SB) 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill, which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD’s internal credit accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. Past development patterns within the district have resulted in a highly diverse visual environment from a cumulative, regional perspective. Overall, the region lacks a cohesive and consistent appearance. Rather, the aesthetic environment differs greatly from location to location with some areas consisting of a variety of land uses and architectural styles. Other areas appear very well-planned and have an orderly appearance. Thus, any future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts would add to this cumulatively diverse aesthetic environment. As noted above, since the specific location and appearance of individual facilities cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative aesthetic impacts is even more uncertain.

However, some of the past projects were determined to have significant adverse impacts on aesthetics and visual quality, including the potential to (1) result in the conversion of open space to urbanized uses that could contribute to a change in the visual character of the area, (2) result in the obstruction of the views of scenic vistas (e.g., mountains, hillsides, coastline, skyline) or resources (e.g., historic structures, scenic highways/corridors, rock outcroppings), or (3) result in the creation of new sources of light that could affect nighttime views.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG’s El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which

were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The FSAs prepared by the CEC for both the Walnut Creek and Sentinel projects concluded that aesthetics impacts would be significant but could be mitigated to less than significant. The Walnut Creek project would require mitigation for light/glare and visual character. Construction lighting would be directed to the center of the facility and shielded to prevent light from straying offsite. The use of non-glare fixtures and control of lighting direction would be required of operational lighting. In addition, because of a moderately high visual sensitivity of the existing landscape and view characteristics, the CEC required the Walnut Creek facility to be painted in a neutral grey color to mitigate the adverse visual character impacts to less than significant. The CEC concluded that there are no scenic vistas or state scenic highway corridors in the Walnut Creek project vicinity, so impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources were not concluded to be significant.

The CEC concluded in its FSA for the Sentinel project that adverse impacts to visual resources would be generated due to foreground views of the project by nearby residential viewers. The CEC further determined that the moderate overall visual sensitivity, combined with the moderate overall visual change could result in a potentially significant visual impact. The CEC concluded that the visual impact could be mitigated to less than significant by reducing the color contrast of all project structures and including perimeter landscape plantings that would further reduce project texture, color, and form contrast for nearby residential viewers and motorists. The CEC determined that night lighting associated with project construction would result in a potentially significant visual impact. The CEC concluded in its FSA that the lighting impact would be mitigated to less than significant by: 1) keeping minimal brightness consistent with safety; 2) shielding and directing lighting to eliminate all direct off-site illumination and all upward (backscatter) illumination; and 3) ensuring lighting for maintenance purposes would be kept off when not needed. The CEC determined that the project would also result in an adverse visual impact on the scenic corridor of SR 62, however, this impact would not be significant due to the poor existing visual condition. The CEC further determined that construction of the power plant, electric transmission line, underground water and gas pipelines and access road would cause temporary visual impacts due to the presence of equipment, materials, and workforce, but the visual quality and visual sensitivity is low to moderate, so the visual impacts during construction would be less than significant. The CEC concluded that no specific scenic vista points of notable importance were located in the project viewshed so scenic vista impacts were not concluded to be significant.

The CEC concluded in the FSA prepared for the El Segundo project that aesthetics impacts would not be significant. The CEC noted that existing nearby structures present visually chaotic views of fully exposed industrial machinery, piping, ductwork and scaffolding. They contrast strongly with their highly scenic coastal setting and with the

general visual character of other industrial and residential land uses in the surrounding viewshed. From some viewpoints the visual sensitivity is considered high, however, the proposed project would not substantially worsen the existing visual character. The CEC determined that unmitigated night lighting would have the potential to create significant adverse impacts to motorists and visitors to the nearby beach, but impacts to residents in this area would not be anticipated because it was expected that night lighting would be obscured by the intervening existing power units. The CEC noted that construction of new power generating units and a seawall in the area of existing landscaping, which would be removed, will result in a moderate to strong contrast with the previous landscaped setting, and a decline in visual quality of this portion of the setting. The impact would be minimized through landscape and seawall design enhancements resulting in beneficial overall aesthetic impacts.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project, are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative aesthetics impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Aesthetics Impacts**

A number of mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant aesthetics impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse aesthetics impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for aesthetics impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of aesthetics impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant aesthetics impact, the potential exists for future indirect aesthetics impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.2**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts has the potential to generate adverse indirect impacts to agricultural resources depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential indirect impacts on agricultural resources from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

The NOP/IS for the proposed project was circulated on March 17, 2009. At the time the NOP/IS was circulated, the environmental checklist did not include impacts to forest lands as topics to be evaluated as part of a CEQA document. However, as directed by SB97, the Natural Resources Agency adopted Amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions on December 30, 2009. On February 16, 2010, the Office of Administrative Law approved the Amendments and filed them with the Secretary of State for inclusion in the California Code of Regulations. The Amendments became effective on March 18, 2010. As part of the revisions to the CEQA Guidelines adopted by the Natural Resources Agency, the environmental checklist, Appendix G, was revised to include consideration of impacts to forestry lands. Specifically, the Agriculture Resources topic was revised and renamed Agriculture and Forestry Resources and questions were added to include consideration of impacts to forest resources. Although the NOP/IS did not include a preliminary analysis of indirect impacts from the proposed project that could conflict with, or cause rezoning of forest land, to provide a more comprehensive analysis of environmental impacts consistent with current CEQA analysis requirements, indirect impacts from the proposed project that have the potential to adversely affect forest resources, this topic is qualitatively addressed below.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential agricultural and forestry resources impacts is based on comparing the existing settings to expected future conditions with the proposed projects in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse indirect impacts include assessments of impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses, potential conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contract, or other changes that could result in conversion of farmland or forest land.

Mitigation measures would be identified, as feasible and available, on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as “a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment” (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is “significant,” generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant agricultural resource and forestry resource impacts if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- Would convert prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the farmland mapping and monitoring program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.
- Would conflict with existing zoning or agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.
- Would involve changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- Would conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land (defined in Public Resources Code §12220(g)) to other uses.
- Would result in the loss of or conversion of prime forest land, unique forest land or forest land of statewide importance, to non-forest uses.
- Would involve changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest uses.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential agricultural and forestry resource impacts from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on agricultural resources. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of agricultural resource impacts is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only. Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse indirect impacts to agricultural and forestry resources. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse agricultural and forestry resources impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

## **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to change existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to agricultural and forestry resources as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include conflict with zoning or the loss of farmland and forest land. Agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses. Since the construction and operation of new agricultural facilities in areas previously designated for agricultural use would generally not constitute the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use, it is unlikely that an adverse significant impact would occur.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.2-1). The two selected CEQA documents<sup>2</sup>, which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on agricultural resources. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities are typically constructed and operated within areas zoned for agriculture. Accordingly, these projects were found to have less-than-significant impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on agricultural and forestry resources identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.2-1**

**Agricultural/Forest Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant<br>LS – Less-than-Significant<br>LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup><br>N – No impacts               |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination                  |   |  |   |   |
|  | a) Convert Farmland to non-agricultural use | b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract | c) Involve other changes that could result in Conversion of Farmland | d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land | e) Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>   |   |   |  |   |   |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR  | N   | LS  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR   | N   | LS  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>  |   |   |  |   |   |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR  | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR   | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR  | LS  | LS  | LS   | NE  | NE  |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>   |   |   |  |   |   |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR   | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |

**TABLE 5.2-1 (Continued)**

**Agricultural/Forest Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant<br>LS – Less-than-Significant<br>LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup><br>N – No impacts               |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination                  |   |  |   |   |
|  | a) Convert Farmland to non-agricultural use | b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract | c) Involve other changes that could result in Conversion of Farmland | d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land | e) Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR  | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>   |   |   |  |   |   |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR                                       | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR   | LS  | LS  | LS   | NE  | NE  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR  | LS  | LS  | LS   | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>  |   |   |  |   |   |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR   | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR   | LS  | LS  | LS   | NE  | NE  |

**TABLE 5.2-1 (Continued)**

**Agricultural/Forest Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant<br>LS – Less-than-Significant<br>LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup><br>N – No impacts               |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination                  |   |  |   |   |
|  | a) Convert Farmland to non-agricultural use | b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract | c) Involve other changes that could result in Conversion of Farmland | d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land | e) Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LS  | LS  | LS   | NE  | NE  |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | N or LS                                     | N or LS   | N or LS  | NE  | NE  |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |   |   |  |   |   |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Utility Projects (Includes Power Plants)</b>  |   |   |  |   |   |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |

**TABLE 5.2-1 (Concluded)**

**Agricultural/Forest Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant<br>LS – Less-than-Significant<br>LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup><br>N – No impacts               |  |   |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed  | Significance Determination                  |   |  |   |   |
|   | a) Convert Farmland to non-agricultural use | b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract | c) Involve other changes that could result in Conversion of Farmland | d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land | e) Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>  |   |   |  |   |   |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | N or LS                                     | N or LS   | N or LS  | NE  | NE  |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE  |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |   |   |  |   |   |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | S   | LS  | LS   | NE  | NE  |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N   | N   | N  | NE  | NE  |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |   |   |  |   |   |

**a) Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed no impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Since the construction and

operation of new agricultural facilities in areas previously designated for agricultural use would generally not constitute the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use, it is unlikely that an adverse significant impact would occur.

However, based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on agricultural resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural zones or in areas subject to the Williamson Act Contract that could result in conflict with zoning or violation of the contract.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting in conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act Contract associated with the implementation of the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Other Changes to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category found that neither document discussed impacts related to other changes that would convert farmland to non-agricultural uses. Since the construction and operation of new agricultural facilities in areas previously designated for agricultural use would generally not constitute the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use, it is unlikely that an adverse significant impact would occur.

However, based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category did not include an analysis of potential impacts related to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land because this

requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conversion of forest land to other uses because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to convert forest land to other uses as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of forest land to other uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential for the conversion of farmland or forest land or conflict with agricultural or forestry zoning. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts to agricultural and forestry resources in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.2-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on agricultural resources, including conflicts with zoning. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings. Project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant as most retail and service establishments surveyed are located in developed urban areas and would not result in the loss of farmland or conflict with agricultural zoning designations. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on agricultural and forestry resources identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Six of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either no impacts or a less-than-significant impact related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses; the other two CEQA documents did not discuss impacts related to the conversion of farmland. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** Six of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service\_facility category disclosed either no impacts or a less-than-significant impact on agricultural resources; the other two CEQA documents did not discuss impacts related to the potential conflict with agricultural zoning. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural zones or in areas subject to the Williamson Act Contract that could result in conflict with zoning or violation of the contract.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different

environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting in conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act Contract associated with the implementation of the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Other Changes to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Six of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either no impacts or a less-than-significant impact on agricultural resources; the other two CEQA documents did not discuss impacts related to other changes that could convert farmland to non-agricultural uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land.** All eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses.** All eight CEQA documents surveyed for past projects in the retail/service facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conversion of forest land to other uses because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to convert forest land to other uses as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of forest land to other uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for resulting in the loss of farmland or forest land conflicting with agricultural or forestry zoning. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts to agricultural and forestry resources. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.2-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on agricultural resources. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas. Project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts since most of the commercial facilities are located in developed urban areas and would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on agricultural and forestry resources identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Seven of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed no impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses; the other two CEQA documents did not discuss impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** Seven of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed no impacts on agricultural resources; the other two CEQA documents did not discuss impacts related to conflicts with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act Contract. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural zones or in areas subject to the Williamson Act Contract that could result in conflict with zoning or violation of the contract.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting in conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act Contract associated with the implementation of the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Other Changes to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Seven of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed no impacts on agricultural resources; the other two CEQA documents did not discuss these impacts. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land.** All nine CEQA documents for the past projects in the large commercial facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were

prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses.** All nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conversion of forest land to other uses because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to convert forest land to other uses as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of forest land to other uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Accordingly, based on these historical data, a small number of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities is anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to alter areas designated for agricultural uses and result in the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse impacts to agricultural resources. The potential also exists for future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse impacts to forestry resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.2-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on agricultural uses. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of impacts on agricultural and forestry resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on agricultural resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural zones or in areas subject to the Williamson Act Contract that could result in conflict with zoning or violation of the contract.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting in conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson

Act Contract associated with the implementation of the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Other Changes to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on agricultural resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land.** All four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses.** All four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conversion of forest land to other uses because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to convert forest land to other uses as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time

the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of forest land to other uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, and parking structures. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and would, therefore, would have a low potential for impacting agricultural and forestry lands. Therefore, these future facilities would have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts to agricultural and forestry resources. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse impacts to agricultural and forestry resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.2-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on agricultural resources including the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses and potential conflicts with agriculture zoning. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities. However, these projects were generally found to have less-than-significant impacts to agricultural resources as most of these projects are located in developed urban areas. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on agricultural and forestry resources identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Eleven (11) of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses; the other four documents did not discuss the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in

Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** Eleven (11) of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on agricultural resources; the other four documents did not discuss the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural zones or in areas subject to the Williamson Act Contract that could result in conflict with zoning or violation of the contract.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting in conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act Contract associated with the implementation of the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Other Changes to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Eleven (11) if the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on agricultural resources; the other four documents did not discuss the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land.** All 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses.** All 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conversion of forest land to other uses because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to convert forest land to other uses as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of forest land to other uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data, as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and

medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities). Any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would have a low potential for impacting agricultural and forestry lands and agricultural and forestry zoning. Therefore, transportation facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts to agricultural and forestry resources. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts on agricultural and forestry resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.2-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on agricultural resources. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including shipping infrastructure and bus storage and maintenance facilities. However, the CEQA documents for the projects that were surveyed were found to have no impacts on agricultural resources as most of these projects were located in developed mixed-use, industrial, and commercial zoned areas and not agricultural areas. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** One of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed no impact on agricultural resources; the other two documents did not discuss the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** One of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed no impact on agricultural resources; the other two documents did not discuss impacts on agricultural resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in

Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural zones or in areas subject to the Williamson Act Contract that could result in conflict with zoning or violation of the contract.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting in conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act Contract associated with the implementation of the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Other Changes to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** One of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed no impact on agricultural resources; the other two documents did not discuss impacts on agricultural resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category did not include an

analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conversion of forest land to other uses because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to convert forest land to other uses as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of forest land to other uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity and the distributed nature of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Although these facilities would typically be constructed in industrial zoned areas, these facilities may be sited near or directly adjacent to agricultural or forestry areas. Accordingly, it is likely that conflicts may occur regarding agricultural or forestry zoning. Therefore, it is possible future construction and operation of utility facilities could generate significant adverse impacts on agricultural and forestry resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.2-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on agricultural resources. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, could affect agricultural resources, including the loss of farmland or result in a conflict with existing agricultural zoning. More specifically, the following

discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on agricultural and forestry resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed no impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed no impacts related to the agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act Contract; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural zones or in areas subject to the Williamson Act Contract that could result in conflict with zoning or violation of the contract.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting in conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act Contract associated with the implementation of the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Other Changes to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed no impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual

projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land.** All four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses.** All four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conversion of forest land to other uses because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to convert forest land to other uses as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of forest land to other uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new

construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings. Depending on where these new facilities are located, significant impacts to agricultural and forestry resources could occur.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.2-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on agricultural resources. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in impacts to agricultural resources. However, adverse effects were not found to be significant since most of these facilities were located in developed urban industrial areas and not agricultural areas. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on agricultural and forestry resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed no impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed no impacts on agricultural resources; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past

(Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural zones or in areas subject to the Williamson Act Contract that could result in conflict with zoning or violation of the contract.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting in conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act Contract associated with the implementation of the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Other Changes to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed no impacts on agricultural resources; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land.** All four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses.** All four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conversion of forest land to other uses because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to convert forest land to other uses as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of forest land to other uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. Siting these types of facilities could have the potential to affect agricultural and forestry lands and zoning designations. Accordingly, it is possible that these types of project would significantly impact agricultural and forestry areas. Therefore, these future heavy industrial facilities have the potential of generating significant adverse impacts to agricultural and forestry resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.2-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on agricultural resources including the loss of farmland and conflicts with agricultural zoning. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on agricultural and forestry resources identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed no impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project # 51 SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR), the lead agency concluded that the heavy industrial facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Furthermore, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on agricultural zoning and Williamson Act constricts. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural zones or in areas subject to the Williamson Act Contract that could result in conflict with zoning or violation of the contract.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting in conflict with agricultural zoning or the Williamson Act Contract associated with the implementation of the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Other Changes to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Uses.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on other changes to convert farmland. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in agricultural areas that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to agricultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Conflict with or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) Other changes that convert Forest Land to Other Uses.** All three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category did not include an analysis of potential indirect impacts related to conversion of forest land to other uses because this requirement was not in effect at the time the CEQA documents were prepared. Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn from the survey regarding potential adverse impacts to forestry resources. It is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have the potential to convert forest land to other uses as a result of being sited in or near such locations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to forestry resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of forest land to other uses resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that almost all of the past projects had no impacts or less-than-significant impacts to agricultural resources. However, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff’s independent judgment, and the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was

prepared, agricultural and forestry resources impacts as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other “past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects.” [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal credit accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per SB 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez), proposed Senate Bill (SB) 388 (Calderon) and potentially one other bill, which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD’s internal credit accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. As discussed earlier in this section, there is an on-going trend of migration of dairy livestock operations from the district to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization. The direct loss of farmlands resulting from some of the past projects seems to reflect this on-going decline in agricultural operations in the district. Any future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts that would result in the conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses would add to this cumulative decline in agricultural uses in the district. Since the specific location of individual facilities cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative impacts on agricultural resources is even more uncertain. However, future conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses resulting from the approval of the project could result in a cumulatively significant contribution to the overall availability of agricultural resources within the district.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts to three power plants. The three power plant projects, NRG’s El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California

Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The FSAs prepared by the CEC for all three power plant projects concluded that agricultural resources impacts would be not significant. A power plant may create a significant land use impact, for example, if it converts prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance to nonagricultural uses.

According to the CEC, there is no agricultural land within or near the proposed Sentinel power plant site or project related features and facilities and that none of the lands affected by the Sentinel project are zoned for agricultural uses. In addition, the CEC determined that the Sentinel project and related facilities are located on land that is vacant and considered nonagricultural land by the California Department of Conservation who classified the areas surrounding the Sentinel site as “Urban Built-up Area.” Finally, the CEC concluded that the Sentinel proposed project and related facilities are not subject to an Agricultural Land Conservation (Williamson Act) contract and, thus, would generate no significant agricultural resources impacts.

The CEC concluded that the El Segundo project would also result in no significant agricultural resources impacts because there are no agricultural lands within the region of the El Segundo project and there are no agricultural uses or restrictions in the vicinity of the El Segundo facility.

The FSA prepared by the CEC for the Walnut Creek project determined that no areas used for agricultural production are located within a one-mile radius of the facility, the project does not convert agricultural land or resources to nonagricultural uses, and the site is developed industrial land that has no agricultural value. Thus, the CEC concluded that the Walnut Creek project would generate no significant adverse agricultural resources impacts.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project, are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative agricultural resources impacts.

In addition, the project may result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on forestry resources.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Agricultural Resources Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant agricultural resources impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing

air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse agricultural and forestry resources impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for agricultural and forestry resources impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of agricultural and forestry resources impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

#### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant agricultural or forestry resources impact, the potential exists for future indirect agricultural and forestry resources impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.3**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - AIR QUALITY**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## INTRODUCTION

Chapter 4 addresses direct air quality and greenhouse gas impacts projected to result from sources receiving permits under Rules 1304 and 1309.1, pursuant to proposed Rule 1315. In addition, Chapter 4 qualitatively discusses the indirect emissions associated with constructing and operating such facilities and presents significance conclusions based upon the combined direct and indirect air quality and greenhouse gas impacts of the proposed project. This sub-chapter provides further information regarding the potential air quality and greenhouse gas impacts associated with the types of individual facilities that might be eligible for offsets under the proposed project based upon a review of CEQA documents for past projects.

## IMPACT ANALYSIS

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential air quality and greenhouse gas impacts from future representative facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on the air quality conditions of a given area. Based on the information described in Subchapter 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of indirect air quality and greenhouse gas impacts is qualitative in nature, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level impacts will not be affected by the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only. Future new projects could result in either new construction or modification of existing structures. As a result, construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility has the potential to create significant adverse air quality impacts. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse air quality impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit and

rezone existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to urbanization<sup>1</sup>. Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to air quality as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include the generation of fugitive dust emissions that result from structure demolition and site work, as well as combustion exhaust emissions that result from on-site construction equipment, haul truck trips, and worker commute trips. Combustion exhaust emissions associated with on-site construction equipment, haul truck trips, and worker commute trips, as well as fugitive off-gassing emissions (VOCs) associated with the application of architectural coatings and asphalt paving may also result from building construction.

Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to sensitive residential and public recreation areas. The potential scale of farm structures, dairy processing plants, and other agricultural-related structures may result in significant localized air quality impacts to surrounding non-agricultural land uses.

Project-specific impacts were identified from the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.3-1). The two CEQA documents surveyed,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on air quality, including criteria pollutant emissions, odors, and consistency with the AQMP. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities may be of substantial size and mass, which are likely to result in criteria pollutant emissions that exceed applicable significance thresholds and may create objectionable odors and, therefore, are likely to affect air quality. Accordingly, these projects were generally found to have significant air quality impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of air quality impacts identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for agricultural projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.3-1  
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Determinations in Selected Environmental Documents**

| S – Significant  | LS – Less than significant  | LSM – Less than significant with Mitigation   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   | N – No impacts  |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination  |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. | b) Violate any Air Quality Standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. (Construction/Operation) | c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state air quality standard. | d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial pollutant concentrations. (Construction/Operation) | e) Create Objectionable Odors affecting a substantial number of people. | g, h) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gases. |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>                                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR                                    | LS  | LSM/LS  | LS  | NE/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                               | LS  | LS/S  | S   | NE/LS   | S   | S   |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. Medical Office ND in Long Beach                               | N   | LSM/LS  | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR                                  | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | S   |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                   | LS  | S/S   | S   | S/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                               | S*  | S/LS  | S   | S/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                    | NE  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | NE  | NE  |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                | NE  | LS/LS   | LS  | LSM/LS  | NE  | NE  |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                        | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | S/LS  | NE  | LS  |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | LS  | S/S   | S   | S/LS  | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                               |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel EIR                                      | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR                                     | LS  | LS/LS   | S   | LS/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR                                 | LS  | NE/LS   | S   | NE/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                 | LS  | LSM/S   | S   | LS/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | LS  | S/S   | NE  | NE/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR                                  | LS  | LS/S  | S   | S/LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR                                  | LS  | S/S   | S   | S/S   | LS  | LS  |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                            | LS  | S/LS  | S   | S/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                | LS  | S/S   | S   | S/S   | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 20. City of Industry Business Ctr. (NFL Stadium) EIR             | LS  | S/S   | S   | S/LS  | LS  | S   |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR               | LS  | S/S   | NE  | LS/LS   | NE  | NE  |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR                                     | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | LSM/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                | LS  | S/S   | S   | S/LS  | LS  | S   |

**TABLE 5.3-1 (Continued)**  
**Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Determinations in Selected Environmental Documents**

| S – Significant  | LS – Less than significant  | LSM – Less than significant with Mitigation   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   | N – No impacts  |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination  |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. | b) Violate any Air Quality Standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. (Construction/Operation) | c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state air quality standard. | d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial pollutant concentrations. (Construction/Operation) | e) Create Objectionable Odors affecting a substantial number of people. | g, h) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gases. |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR   | NE  | S/LS  | NE  | NE/LS   | NE  | NE  |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR   | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | S/LS  | NE  | NE  |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR   | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR  | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS  |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR  | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS  |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR  | NE  | S/ NE   | NE  | S/NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS  |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR  | LS  | S/LS  | S   | LSM/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR   | LS  | S/LS  | S   | LS/LS   | LS  | LS  |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | LS  | S/S   | S   | S/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR  | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LS  | S/LS  | S   | NE/NE   | LS  | NE  |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.  | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | LS  | S/S   | S   | S/S   | LS  | S   |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | LS  | S/LS  | S   | LS/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | S/LS  | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | NE  | LSM/LSM   | LS  | LSM/LSM   | NE  | NE  |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | LS  | S/S   | NE  | S/S   | NE  | NE  |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR  | LS  | S/S   | S   | NE/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR                      | NE  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS  |

**TABLE 5.3-1 (Concluded)**  
**Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Determinations in Selected Environmental Documents**

| S – Significant   | LS – Less than significant  | LSM – Less than significant with Mitigation   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   | N – No impacts  |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed  | Significance Determination  |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; | b) Violate any Air Quality Standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. (Construction/Operation) | c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state air quality standard. | d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial pollutant concentrations. (Construction/Operation) | e) Create Objectionable Odors affecting a substantial number of people. | g, h) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gases. |
| <b>Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | LS  | LSM/LS  | LS  | LSM/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | LS  | LS/S  | S   | LS/LS   | LS  | LS  |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | LS  | S/S   | S   | NE/NE   | LS  | NE  |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | LS  | S/LSM   | NE  | LS/LS   | NE  | LSM   |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | S*  | S   | S   | LSM/LS  | LS  | NE  |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | LS/LS   | LS  | NE  |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>* Significance conclusion reflects different methodology than has been used in this PEA.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan**  
Both CEQA documents for the two past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less than significant impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air quality plan

**b) Violate any Air Quality Standard.** One of the two CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the agricultural facilities category indicated environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard were less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). One of the CEQA documents (Project #2 – Kings County Dairy Element) concluded that this agricultural project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard.

**c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.** One of the two CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the agricultural facilities category indicated environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants were less-than-cumulatively considerable. However, one of the CEQA documents (Project #2 – Kings County Dairy Element) concluded that the agricultural facility category project has the potential to generate cumulatively considerable adverse environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants.

**d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to sensitive receptors' exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations.

**e) Create Objectionable Odors.** The two CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the agricultural facilities category indicated that for one of the two projects, environmental impacts related to odors were less than significant. However, one of the CEQA documents (Project #2 – Kings County Dairy Element) concluded that the agricultural project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to odors associated with the operation of dairy farms.

**g, h) Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** In one of the two CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the agricultural facilities category, environmental impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions were not discussed. However, in the other CEQA document (Project #2 – Kings County Dairy Element), the lead agency concluded that the agricultural facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However,

based on these historical data, only some of these facilities (an average of approximately 26 facilities per year) were anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of permitted stationary source equipment at retail/services facilities that may be constructed in the future include backup generators; service station gasoline storage and dispensing equipment; dry cleaning equipment; printing presses; boilers; paint spray booths; and food frying, charbroiling, and other cooking equipment. On a programmatic level, impacts to air quality as a result of constructing future new retail/service facilities may include the generation of fugitive dust emissions that result from structure demolition and site work, as well as combustion exhaust emissions that result from on-site construction equipment, haul truck trips, and worker commute trips. Combustion exhaust emissions associated with on-site construction equipment, haul truck trips, and worker commute trips, as well as fugitive off-gassing emissions (VOCs) associated with the application of architectural coatings and asphalt paving may also result from building erection.

Although retail/service facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for such uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to sensitive residential and public recreation areas. The potential scale of retail-related structures may result in significant localized air quality impacts to surrounding land uses.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail/service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.3-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on air quality, including local and regional construction emissions and regional operational emissions. These projects involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings, which were found to result in criteria pollutant emissions that exceed applicable thresholds, create objectionable odors, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and, therefore, are likely to affect air quality. Accordingly, these projects were generally found to have significant air quality impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of air quality impacts identified in the CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan.** Five of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail service facilities category indicated that conflicts with the AQMP were either less than significant or no impact; two of the CEQA documents did not address this issue. However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #6 – Archstone Hollywood), the lead agency concluded that this retail/service project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to conflicts with the AQMP. The EIR for the Archstone Hollywood project contains inconsistent statements regarding this impact. The EIR states that the project would result in construction emissions exceeding

SCAQMD significance thresholds, but recognizes that dust control measures and vehicle maintenance requirements would ensure consistency with the AQMP. This impact should have been classified as a potential to contribute to violations of air quality standards under criterion b, rather than as a conflict with the AQMP under criterion a. The EIR for the Archstone Hollywood project does not indicate that facilities with sources receiving permits under the proposed project would result in conflicts with the AQMP.

**b) Violate any Air Quality Standard.** Four of the eight CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the retail/service facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of an air quality significance threshold were less than significant. However, the other four CEQA documents concluded that the retail/service projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard (Projects #5 – Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan, #6 – Archstone Hollywood, #9 – Westfield Fashion Square Expansion, and #10 – New Century Plan).

**c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.** Five of the eight CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the retail/service facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants were less than cumulatively considerable. However, three of the CEQA documents concluded that the retail/service facility has the potential to generate a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants (Projects #5 – Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan, #6 – Archstone Hollywood, and #10 – New Century Plan).

**d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.** Three of the eight CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the retail/service facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations were less than significant. However, five of the CEQA documents concluded that the retail/service projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (Projects #4 – Wilshire La Brea, #5 – Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan, #6 – Archstone Hollywood, #9 – Westfield Fashion Square Expansion, and #10 – New Century Plan).

**e) Create Objectionable Odors.** Five of the eight CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the retail/service facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to objectionable odors; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to objectionable odors.

**g, h) Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** In seven of the eight CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the retail/service facilities category, environmental impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions were either not discussed or found to be less than significant. However, one of the CEQA documents (Project #4 – Wilshire La Brea

Project), concluded that the retail/service project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data only some of these facilities were anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Based on historical trends, new large commercial facilities could be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use, residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for substantial construction-related emissions. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant construction-related impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant air quality impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected available environmental documents (see Table 5.3-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on air quality, including construction emissions and operational emissions. These projects involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found to result in construction and operational period emissions. Based on a review of these documents, commercial facilities may result in criteria pollutant emissions that exceed applicable thresholds and may result in cumulatively considerable impacts and, therefore, are likely to affect air quality. Accordingly, these projects were generally found to have significant air quality impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of air quality impacts identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan .** All nine CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the large commercial facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air quality plan.

**b) Violate any Air Quality Standard.** Two of the nine CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the large commercial facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of an air quality significance threshold were less than significant (without or with mitigation). The other seven CEQA documents concluded that the large commercial projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard during construction and

operation (Projects #11-Sunset Doheny Hotel, #14 – Corbin and Nordhoff Redevelopment, #15 – Boulevard 6200, #16 – Panorama Palace, #17 – Metro Universal, #18 – Paseo Plaza Hollywood, and #19 – Plaza at the Glen).

**c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.**

One of the nine CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the large commercial facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants were considered to be less than cumulatively considerable. Another CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, seven of the CEQA documents concluded that the large commercial projects have the potential to generate cumulatively considerable adverse environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants during construction and operation (Projects # 12 – 2000 Avenue of the Stars, # 13 – Travelodge Hotel, #14 – Corbin and Nordhoff Redevelopment, #16 – Panorama Place, #17, Metro Universal, #18 – Paseo Plaza Hollywood, and #19, Plaza at the Glen).

**d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.**

Four of the nine CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the large commercial facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations were less than significant. However, five of the CEQA documents concluded that the large commercial projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (Projects #11 – Sunset Doheny Hotel, #16 – Panorama Place, #17, Metro Universal, #18 – Paseo Plaza Hollywood, and #19, Plaza at the Glen).

**e) Create Objectionable Odors.**

Four of the nine CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the large commercial facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to odors; the other five CEQA documents did not address impacts related to objectionable odors.

**g, h) Greenhouse Gas Emissions.**

Four of the nine CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the large commercial facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions; the other five documents did not address impacts related to greenhouse gas.

**Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, a small number of new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities is anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical trends, these types of projects would have

potential for increased construction and operational emissions. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to have significant air quality impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected available environmental documents (see Table 5.3-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on air quality, including construction emissions and operational emissions. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, outdoor lighting, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were determined to result in exceedances of applicable thresholds, cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutants, and substantial greenhouse gas emissions. Accordingly, these projects were found to have significant air quality impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of air quality impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan.** All four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air quality plan.

**b) Violate any Air Quality Standard.** All four of the CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of an air quality significance threshold were considered to be significant (Projects #20 – City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium), #21 – LA Live – Sports and Entertainment District, #22 – Canyon Hills, and #23 – Wilmington Waterfront Development).

**c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.** One of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facilities indicated that environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants were considered to be less than cumulatively considerable; one other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, two of the CEQA documents (Projects #20 – City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) and #23 – Wilmington Waterfront Development), concluded that the entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to generate cumulatively considerable adverse environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants.

**d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.** Two of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the exposure of

sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations were less than significant. However, the other CEQA documents (Projects #20 – City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) and #23 – Wilmington Waterfront Development) concluded that the entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

**e) Create Objectionable Odors.** Three of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to odors; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to objectionable odors.

**g, h) Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** In two of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facilities category, environmental impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions were not discussed. However, two of CEQA documents (Projects #20 – City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) and #23 – Wilmington Waterfront Development) concluded that the entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. More specifically, the CEQA documents for these projects indicated that project-related greenhouse gas emissions would significantly contribute to global climate change impacts in California on a cumulative basis.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities were anticipated to involve new construction since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temples. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Based on historical trends, these types of projects would have the potential for increased construction and operational emissions. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to have significant air quality impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected available environmental documents (see Table 5.3-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on air quality, including local and regional construction emissions and regional operational emissions. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools,

hospital buildings, and other public facilities, which were determined to result in exceedances of applicable thresholds, cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutants, and substantial greenhouse gas emissions. Accordingly, these projects were found to have significant air quality impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of air quality impacts identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan.**

Thirteen of the 15 CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the institutional facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air quality plan were less than significant; two of the 15 CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue.

**b) Violate any Air Quality Standard.**

Six of the 15 CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the institutional facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of an air quality significance threshold were less than significant. However, the other nine CEQA documents concluded that the institutional projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of a threshold (Projects #24 – Caltrans District 7 Headquarters, #25 – Buckley School Enhancement, #26 – Cedars Sinai West Tower, #29 – New Paradise Church, #31 – Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation, #32 – Temple Israel of Hollywood, #33 – USC Health Sciences Campus, #35 – West LA College, and #37 – Harvard-Westlake School).

**c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.**

Nine of the 15 CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the institutional facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants were less than cumulatively considerable; two other CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, four of the CEQA documents (Projects #31 – Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation, #32 – Temple Israel of Hollywood, #33 – USC Health Sciences Campus, and #35 – West LA College) concluded that the institutional projects have the potential to generate cumulatively considerable adverse environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants.

**d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.**

Nine of the 15 CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the institutional facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations were less than significant (without or with mitigation); one CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, for five of the CEQA documents (#25 – Buckley School Enhancement, #26 – Cedars Sinai West Tower, #29 – New Paradise Church, #33 – USC Health Sciences Campus, and #37 – Harvard-Westlake School) concluded that the institutional projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) **Create Objectionable Odors.** Twelve of the 15 CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the institutional facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to objectionable odors; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to objectionable odors.

g, h) **Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Four of the 15 CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the institutional facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions; the other 11 CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future. Similarly, continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure may increase the number of transportation projects in the future requiring permits and, potentially, offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset account. However, since past transportation facility projects consisted primarily of highways and roads, which typically do not require stationary source permits, use of past permits and pending permits to predict future transportation facilities means that the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future would not be expected to constitute a large number.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting. Based on historical trends, these types of projects would have potential for increased construction and operational emissions. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future transportation projects to have significant air quality impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the available environmental documents (see Table 5.3-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on air quality, including construction emissions and operational emissions. These projects involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, bus storage and maintenance facilities, and mixed-use residential and commercial facilities, some of which were found to result in violations of air quality standards or exceedances of thresholds, cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutants, and substantial greenhouse gas emissions. Accordingly, these projects were found to have significant air quality impacts. More specifically, the following

discussions provide an overall summary of the types of air quality impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan.** All three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the transportation facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air quality plan.

**b) Violate any Air Quality Standard.** One of the three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the transportation facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of an air quality significance threshold were considered to be less than significant. However, two CEQA documents (Projects # 39 – TraPac Terminal Expansion and #40 – Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project) concluded that the transportation-related projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of a threshold.

**c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.** One of the three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the transportation facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants were less than cumulatively considerable. However, two of the CEQA documents (Projects # 39 – TraPac Terminal Expansion and #40 – Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project) concluded that the transportation-related projects have the potential to generate cumulatively considerable adverse environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants.

**d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.** One of the three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the transportation facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations were less than significant. However, two of the CEQA documents (Projects # 39 – TraPac Terminal Expansion and #41 – Canoga Park Orange Line Extension) concluded that the transportation-related projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

**e) Create Objectionable Odors.** All three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the transportation facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to objectionable odors.

**g, h) Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** One of the three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the transportation facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions were less than significant; one other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, one of the CEQA documents (Project # 39 – TraPac Terminal Expansion) concluded

that the transportation-related project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical trend, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be established in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., gas turbines, boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and low- to medium-scale buildings for landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional demand for public infrastructure. Due to the necessity for many public infrastructure and utility services, these types of facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Based on the historical trend, these types of projects would have the potential for increased construction and operational emissions. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future utility-related projects to have significant air quality impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected available environmental documents (see Table 5.3-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on air quality, including construction emissions and operational emissions. These projects generally involve the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, some of which were found to result in violations of air quality standards and exceedances of thresholds, cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutants, and substantial greenhouse gas emissions. Accordingly, these projects were found to have significant air quality impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of air quality impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan.** Two of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the utility project facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air quality plan; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue.

**b) Violate any Air Quality Standard.** Two of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the utility project facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of an air quality significance threshold were considered to be less than significant. However,

two of the CEQA documents (Projects # 43 – LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications and #44 – Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center) concluded that the utility projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard.

**c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.** Two of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the utility project facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants were less than cumulatively considerable; one CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, one of the CEQA documents (Project #44 – Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center) concluded that the utility project has the potential to generate cumulatively considerable adverse environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants.

**d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.** Three of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the utility project facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations were less than significant. However, one of the CEQA documents (Project #43 – LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications) concluded that the utility project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

**e) Create Objectionable Odors.** Two of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the utility project facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to objectionable odors; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to objectionable odors.

**g, h) Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** One of the four CEQA documents prepared for a past project in the utility project facilities category disclosed a less than significant impact related to greenhouse gas emissions; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue.

#### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities were anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and warehouse/retail facilities. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings, which may require moderate amounts of construction activities, potentially resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the available environmental documents (see Table 5.3-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on air quality, including construction emissions and operational emissions. These projects involved the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures, some of which were found to result in violations of air quality standards and cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutants. Accordingly, these projects were found to have significant adverse air quality impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of air quality impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan.** All four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air quality plan.
- b) **Violate any Air Quality Standard.** Two of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of an air quality significance threshold were less than significant. However, two of the CEQA documents (Projects #47 – Alessandro Business Center and #48 – City of San Dimas Costco Development) concluded that the light industrial/warehouse projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard.
- c) **Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.** Two of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants were considered to be less than cumulatively considerable. However, two of the CEQA documents (Projects #47 – Alessandro Business Center and #48 – City of San Dimas Costco Development) concluded that the light industrial/warehouse projects have the potential to generate cumulatively considerable adverse environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants.
- d) **Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.** Three of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue.
- e) **Create Objectionable Odors.** All four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to objectionable odors.

**g, h) Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Two of the four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions; the other two documents did not address impacts related to this issue.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities were anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas, which may require moderate amounts of construction activities, which may result in significant air quality impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the available environmental documents (see Table 5.3-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on air quality, including construction emissions and operational emissions. These projects involved the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transport facilities, the construction and operation, some of which were found to result in violations of air quality standards or exceedances of significance thresholds, cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutants, and conflict with applicable plans and rules. Accordingly, these projects were found to have significant air quality impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of air quality impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan.** Two of the three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the heavy industrial facilities category indicated that less than significant environmental impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air quality plan were anticipated to occur. However, the third CEQA document (Project #51 – SRG Chino South Industrial Park) concluded that the heavy industrial project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air quality plan. This conclusion was based upon an analysis demonstrating that emissions of criteria pollutants from project construction and operation would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for mass emissions of criteria pollutants. Therefore, the impact should have been categorized under criterion b, rather than criterion a. The EIR does not indicate any potential for actual conflict with the AQMP.

**b) Violate any Air Quality Standard.** One of the three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the heavy industrial facilities category indicated that environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or exceedance of an air quality significance threshold were considered to be less than significant. However, two of the CEQA documents (Projects #50 – Chevron Projects Company and #51 – SRG Chino South Industrial Park) concluded that the heavy industrial projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard.

**c) Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.** One of the three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the heavy industrial facilities indicated environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants were considered to be less than cumulatively considerable; one CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, the other CEQA document (Project #51 – SRG Chino South Industrial Park) concluded that the heavy industrial project had the potential to generate cumulatively considerable adverse environmental impacts related to the increase in criteria pollutants.

**d) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.** All three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the heavy industrial facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

**e) Create Objectionable Odors.** Two of the three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the heavy industrial facilities category disclosed less than significant impacts related to objectionable odors; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to objectionable odors.

**g, h) Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Two of the three CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the heavy industrial facilities category did not address impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. The remaining CEQA document (Project #50 – Chevron Products Company Product Reliability and Optimization Project) concluded that the heavy industrial project had the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the increase in GHG emissions. GHG emission impacts were mitigated to less than significant levels.

## Summary of Findings

The review of 52 environmental documents found that many of the past projects had environmental impacts related to air quality that were either less than significant or less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, some of the CEQA documents found that the past projects have the potential to generate significant impacts related to the violations of air quality standards, cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutants, and substantial greenhouse gas emissions.

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.4**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary first step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse impacts to biological resources depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential indirect impacts on biological resources from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential impacts to biological resources is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed projects in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse indirect impacts to biological resources include assessments of impacts to sensitive species, riparian habitat, wetlands, interference with movement of native species, and potential conflict with policies or ordinances. Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant biological resource impacts if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- The project would result in a loss of plant communities or animal habitat considered to be rare, threatened or endangered by federal, state or local agencies.
- The project would interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species.
- The project would adversely affect aquatic communities through construction or operation of the project.
- The project would have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

- Conflict with biological policies or ordinances.
- Conflict with applicable conservation plan.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on biological resources. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts on biological resources is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse biological resources impacts. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in development that is inconsistent with adjacent sensitive biological resources. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse biological resource impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to biological resources as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include potentially altering undeveloped open space and natural areas and developing hillsides. Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to areas known to support sensitive species and other biological

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

resources. The potential scale of farm structures, dairy processing plants, and other agricultural-related structures may result in significant impacts on biological resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.4-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on biological resources. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities are typically constructed and operated within areas zoned for agriculture and are unlikely to significantly impact biological resources. Accordingly, these projects were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on biological resources identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a) Sensitive Species.** One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures on sensitive species; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on sensitive species. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on biological resources, including sensitive plant and animal species.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to sensitive species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Riparian Habitat.** Both CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on riparian habitat. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near sensitive riparian habitats to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents were reviewed since they illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.4-1  
Biological Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                         |  |  |   |   |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts  |  |  |   |   |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b>                       |  |  |   |   |   |
|   | <b>a) Result in adverse effect on sensitive species</b> | <b>b) Result in adverse effect on riparian habitat</b> | <b>c) Result in adverse effect on protected wetlands</b> | <b>d) Interfere with movement of any native species</b> | <b>e) Conflict with biological policies or ordinances</b> | <b>f) Conflict with Conservation plan</b> |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR   | LSM   | LSM  | LS   | LSM   | LS  | N   |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                                      | NE  | LS   | LS   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                       |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                               | N   | N  | N  | N   | N   | N   |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR   | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                          | LS  | LSM  | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                                      | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                           | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                       | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                               | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                                      |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel   | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR  | N   | N  | N  | N   | LSM   | N   |

**TABLE 5.4-1 (Continued)**  
**Biological Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| S – Significant   |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                        |  |   |   |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |   | N – No impacts   |  |   |   |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b>                       |  |  |   |   |   |
|   | <b>a) Result in adverse effect on sensitive species</b> | <b>b) Result in adverse effect on riparian habitat</b> | <b>c) Result in adverse effect on protected wetlands</b> | <b>d) Interfere with movement of any native species</b> | <b>e) Conflict with biological policies or ordinances</b> | <b>f) Conflict with Conservation plan</b> |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                        | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LSM   | LS  |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR   | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR   | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR   | LS  | LSM  | NE   | LSM   | LS  | N   |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                                   | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                       | LSM   | LSM  | N  | LS  | LSM   | LS  |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                            |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR                  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR                      | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR  | LSM   | LSM  | LSM  | LSM   | S   | LS  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                       | LS  | LSM  | LSM  | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR                                | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |

**TABLE 5.4-1 (Continued)**  
**Biological Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                 |   |  |  |                                    |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       |  | N – No impacts                                  |   |  |  |                                    |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |  |   |   |  |  |                                    |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination                       |   |   |  |  |                                    |
|  | a) Result in adverse effect on sensitive species | b) Result in adverse effect on riparian habitat | c) Result in adverse effect on protected wetlands | d) Interfere with movement of any native species | e) Conflict with biological policies or ordinances | f) Conflict with Conservation plan |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                       | LS   | LS  | N   | LS   | LSM  | LS                                 |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                     | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE                                 |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                    | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE                                 |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR                              | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE                                 |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR                              | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   | LSM  | NE                                 |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR                         | LSM  | LSM   | NE  | NE   | LSM  | NE                                 |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                    | N  | N   | N   | N  | LSM  | N                                  |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR                               | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE                                 |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR                               | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE                                 |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR            | LSM  | LS  | NE  | LSM  | LSM  | NE                                 |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LSM  | LSM   | NE  | S  | NE   | NE                                 |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.                    | N  | N   | N   | N  | N  | N                                  |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR                                | N  | N   | NE  | NE   | LSM  | N                                  |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR               | LSM  | LSM   | NE  | LS   | LSM  | N                                  |

**TABLE 5.4-1 (Continued)**  
**Biological Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| S – Significant  |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                        |  |   |   |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant   |   | N – No impacts   |  |   |   |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>                      | <b>Significance Determination</b>                       |  |  |   |   |   |
|  | <b>a) Result in adverse effect on sensitive species</b> | <b>b) Result in adverse effect on riparian habitat</b> | <b>c) Result in adverse effect on protected wetlands</b> | <b>d) Interfere with movement of any native species</b> | <b>e) Conflict with biological policies or ordinances</b> | <b>f) Conflict with Conservation plan</b> |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | S   | LSM  | LSM  | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LSM   | LSM  | LS   | LS  | LSM   | LS  |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | LS  | LS   | NE   | NE  | LS  | NE  |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR                      | LSM   | LSM  | LSM  | LS  | LSM   | LSM                                       |
| <b>Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities</b>   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR   | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR   | LSM   | LSM  | NE   | LSM   | LSM   | NE  |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costeo Development Project EIR   | LSM   | LS   | NE   | NE  | LSM   | NE  |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR  | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |

**TABLE 5.4-1 (Concluded)**  
**Biological Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| S – Significant   |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                        |  |   |   |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |   | N – No impacts   |  |   |   |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|   | <b>Significance Determination</b>                       |  |  |   |   |   |
|   | <b>a) Result in adverse effect on sensitive species</b> | <b>b) Result in adverse effect on riparian habitat</b> | <b>c) Result in adverse effect on protected wetlands</b> | <b>d) Interfere with movement of any native species</b> | <b>e) Conflict with biological policies or ordinances</b> | <b>f) Conflict with Conservation plan</b> |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | N   |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LSM   | LSM  | N  | N   | N   | N   |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N   | N  | N  | N   | N   | N   |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |   |  |  |   |   |   |

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Wetlands.** Both CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on protected wetlands. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near sensitive wetlands to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to wetlands from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Movement of Native Species.** One of the two CEQA documents a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures on movement of native species. The other document did not address impacts related to the potential interference of movement of native species. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a wildlife corridor that could result in habitat degradation, interference with movement of wildlife species or migratory fish, and impacts on migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites. These impacts may occur through grading or excavation, increases in water or air pollutants, increased noise, light, or vibration, interruption of fresh or salt water supplies, reduction in food supplies or foraging areas, or interference with established wildlife movement patterns on or between habitat areas to create significant adverse impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on wildlife corridors and related to the movement of native species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) **Conflict with Policies, Ordinances, or Conservation Plans.** One of the CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed either a

less-than-significant impact or no impact related to conflicts with policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources; the other CEQA document did not disclose impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could result in conflicts with applicable policies, ordinances, or conservation plans for a specific area to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the last five years. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential for alteration of undeveloped open space and natural areas resulting in impacts to biological resources. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse biological impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.4-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on biological resources. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings. Project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts as most retail and service establishments surveyed are located in developed urban

areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding areas. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on biological resources identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Sensitive Species.** Two of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impact on sensitive species; the six other CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on biological resources, including sensitive plant and animal species.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to sensitive species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Riparian Habitat.** Two of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation or no impact on riparian habitat; the other six CEQA document did not address impacts related to riparian habitat. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near sensitive riparian habitats to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Wetlands.** One of the eight CEQA documents for a past project in the retail/services facility category disclosed no impact on protected wetlands; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts to wetlands. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near sensitive wetlands to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to wetlands from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Movement of Native Species.** One of the eight CEQA documents a past project in the retail/services facility category disclosed no impact on the movement of native species; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts related to potential interference of native species. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a wildlife corridor that could result in habitat degradation, interference with movement of wildlife species or migratory fish, and impacts on migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites. These impacts may occur through grading or excavation, increases in water or air pollutants, increased noise, light, or vibration, interruption of fresh or salt water supplies, reduction in food supplies or foraging areas, or interference with established wildlife movement patterns on or between habitat areas to create significant adverse impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on wildlife corridors and related to the movement of native species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Conflict with Policies, Ordinances, or Conservation Plans.** One of the eight CEQA documents for a past project in the retail/services facility category disclosed no impact related to conflicts with biological policies, ordinances, or conservation plans; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could result in conflicts with applicable policies, ordinances, or conservation plans for a specific area to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding

biological resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of undeveloped open space and natural areas that could support sensitive species or habitat. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant adverse impacts on biological resource. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.4-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on biological resources. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found to result in changes to biological resources, including species and their habitat. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts since most of the commercial facilities are located in developed urban areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding areas. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on biological resources identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Sensitive Species.** Four of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on sensitive species; the other five CEQA documents did not address impacts on sensitive species. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on biological resources, including sensitive plant and animal species.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to sensitive species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Riparian Habitat.** Four of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on riparian habitat; the other five CEQA documents did not address impacts related to riparian habitat. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near sensitive riparian habitats to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Wetlands.** Three of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts on protected wetlands; the other six CEQA documents did not address impacts to wetlands. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near sensitive wetlands to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to wetlands from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Movement of Native Species.** Four of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on movement of native species; the other five CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this

facility category could be sited in or near a wildlife corridor that could result in habitat degradation, interference with movement of wildlife species or migratory fish, and impacts on migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites. These impacts may occur through grading or excavation, increases in water or air pollutants, increased noise, light, or vibration, interruption of fresh or salt water supplies, reduction in food supplies or foraging areas, or interference with established wildlife movement patterns on or between habitat areas to create significant adverse impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on wildlife corridors and related to the movement of native species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Conflict with Policies, Ordinances, or Conservation Plans.** Four of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to conflicts with biological policies, ordinances, or conservation plans; the other five CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could result in conflicts with applicable policies, ordinances, or conservation plans for a specific area to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, some of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities are anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have

the potential to alter undeveloped open space and natural areas that may result in significant impacts on biological resources. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.4-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on biological resources. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, outdoor lighting, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were determined to result in changes to areas potentially supporting biological resources. Accordingly, these projects were found to have significant biological impacts. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Sensitive Species.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporation on sensitive species; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on biological resources, including sensitive plant and animal species.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to sensitive species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Riparian Habitat.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporation on riparian habitat; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category

could be sited near sensitive riparian habitats to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Wetlands.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporation on protected wetlands; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near sensitive wetlands to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to wetlands from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Movement of Native Species.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporation on the movement of native species; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a wildlife corridor that could result in habitat degradation, interference with movement of wildlife species or migratory fish, and impacts on migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites. These impacts may occur through grading or excavation, increases in water or air pollutants, increased noise, light, or vibration, interruption of fresh or salt water supplies, reduction in food supplies or foraging areas, or interference with established wildlife movement patterns on or between habitat areas to create significant adverse impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant.

Therefore, impacts on wildlife corridors and related to the movement of native species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Conflict with Policies or Ordinances.** For one of the projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category, environmental impacts related to conflicts with policies and ordinances regarding biological resources were less-than-significant; two other CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #22- Canyon Hills Project), the lead agency concluded that this entertainment/recreational category project had the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to conflicts with biological policies or ordinances resulting from the removal or potential impacts to over 200 coast live oak trees on the project site.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, and the additional consideration identified above, impacts related to conflicts with biological policies or ordinances resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) **Conflict with Conservation Plan.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to conflict with a conservation plan; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts to conservation plans.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to conservation plans regarding biological resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale

buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and would have a low potential for alteration of undeveloped open space and natural areas. Therefore, these future facilities would have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts on biological resources. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse biological impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.4-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on biological impacts. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities, which were found to result in changes to the surrounding area. However, these projects were generally found to have less-than-significant biological impacts as most of these projects are located in developed urban areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on biological resources identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Sensitive Species.** Eight of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts on sensitive species; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts on sensitive species. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on biological resources, including sensitive plant and animal species.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to sensitive species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Riparian Habitat.** Eight of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts on riparian habitat; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts on riparian habitat. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category

could be sited near sensitive riparian habitats to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Wetlands.** Three of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed no impacts on protected wetlands; the other 12 CEQA documents did not address impacts related to protected wetlands. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near sensitive wetlands to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to wetlands from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Movement of Native Species.** For five of the fifteen CEQA documents, environmental impacts related to the movement of native species were either less-than-significant (without or with mitigation) or no impact; nine other CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #35- West Los Angeles College), the lead agency concluded that this institutional category project had the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the movement of native species and wildlife corridors. More specifically, additional traffic generated by the proposed project, which could substantially increase noise levels, and increased nighttime lighting (particularly that of the new athletic field) were both determined to have a potential to “harass” bird species (particularly raptors) and result in nest abandonment.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, and the additional consideration identified above, impacts on wildlife corridors and related to the movement of native species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Conflict with Policies, Ordinances, or Conservation Plans.** Eight of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to conflicts with biological policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could result in conflicts with applicable policies, ordinances, or conservation plans for a specific area to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data, as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting. However, any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of undeveloped open space and natural areas. Therefore, transportation facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant biological impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts on biological resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.4-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on biological resources. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, bus storage and maintenance facilities, and mixed-use residential and commercial facilities, some of which were found to result in changes to biological resources, including species and their habitat. However, the CEQA documents for the projects that were surveyed were found to generally have less-than-significant impacts on biological resources as most of these projects were located in developed mixed-use, industrial, and commercial zoned areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on biological resources identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Sensitive Species.** For one of the projects in the institutional facility category, environmental impacts on sensitive species were found to be less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures; one of the CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, for one of the CEQA documents (Project #39 – TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147), the lead agency concluded that this transportation-related project had the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the potential disruption of local biological communities in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbors. More specifically, the operation of the proposed facilities at the TraPac Terminal was found to have the potential to introduce non-native species into the harbor via ballast water or vessel hulls, which could substantially disrupt local biological communities to result in a significant impact on biological resources.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, biological impacts related to sensitive species are determined to be significant.

- b) Riparian Habitat.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on riparian habitat; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on riparian habitat. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near sensitive riparian habitats to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Wetlands.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on protected wetland; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to protected wetlands. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near sensitive wetlands to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to wetlands from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Movement of Native Species.** One of the three CEQA documents for a past project in the transportation facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact on movement of native species; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to potential interference of native species. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a wildlife corridor that could result in habitat degradation, interference with movement of wildlife species or migratory fish, and impacts on migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites. These impacts may occur through grading or excavation, increases in water or air pollutants, increased noise, light, or vibration, interruption of fresh or salt water supplies, reduction in food supplies or foraging areas, or interference with established wildlife movement patterns on or between habitat areas to create significant adverse impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on wildlife corridors and related to the movement of native species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Conflict with Policies, Ordinances, or Conservation Plans.** One of the three CEQA documents for a past project in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to conflicts with policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could result in conflicts with applicable policies, ordinances, or conservation plans for a specific area to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades, and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Although these facilities would typically be constructed in industrial zoned areas, these facilities may be sited near or directly adjacent to biologically sensitive areas. The potential scale and height of exhaust structures, flares, and other functional components of a typical large scale industrial utility may result in biological impacts to surrounding uses. Accordingly, it is likely that a number of conflicts may occur regarding biological policies and ordinances. Therefore, future construction and operation of utility facilities could likely generate significant adverse biological impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.4-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to existing power

generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on biological resources. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, and power generating equipment, could generate changes to the surrounding area. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on biological resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Sensitive Species.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utilities facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on sensitive species; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on sensitive species. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on biological resources, including sensitive plant and animal species.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to sensitive species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Riparian Habitat.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utilities facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on riparian habitat; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on riparian habitat. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near sensitive riparian habitats to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Wetlands.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utilities facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on protected wetlands; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts to wetlands. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the

SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near sensitive wetlands to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to wetlands from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Movement of Native Species.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utilities facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on the movement of native species; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to wildlife corridors and the potential interference of native species. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a wildlife corridor that could result in habitat degradation, interference with movement of wildlife species or migratory fish, and impacts on migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites. These impacts may occur through grading or excavation, increases in water or air pollutants, increased noise, light, or vibration, interruption of fresh or salt water supplies, reduction in food supplies or foraging areas, or interference with established wildlife movement patterns on or between habitat areas to create significant adverse impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on wildlife corridors and related to the movement of native species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Conflict with Policies, Ordinances, or Conservation Plans.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utilities facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to conflicts with policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could result in conflicts with applicable policies, ordinances, or conservation plans for a specific area to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings that could require outdoor lighting and moderate amounts of construction activities, which may result in significant adverse biological impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.4-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on biological resources. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in changes to habitat or could impact biological policies or ordinances. However, adverse effects were not found to be significant since most of these facilities were located in developed urban industrial areas and largely compatible with the surrounding resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts to biological resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Sensitive Species.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on sensitive species; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts on sensitive species. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on biological resources, including sensitive plant and animal species.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to sensitive species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Riparian Habitat.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on riparian habitat; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to riparian habitat. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near sensitive riparian habitats to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Wetlands.** None of the CEQA documents surveyed for the proposed project addressed impacts on protected wetlands. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near sensitive wetlands to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to wetlands from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Movement of Native Species.** One of the four CEQA documents for a past project in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures on the movement of native species; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to wildlife corridors or the potential interference of native species. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this

facility category could be sited in or near a wildlife corridor that could result in habitat degradation, interference with movement of wildlife species or migratory fish, and impacts on migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites. These impacts may occur through grading or excavation, increases in water or air pollutants, increased noise, light, or vibration, interruption of fresh or salt water supplies, reduction in food supplies or foraging areas, or interference with established wildlife movement patterns on or between habitat areas to create significant adverse impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on wildlife corridors and related to the movement of native species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Conflict with Policies, Ordinances, or Conservation Plans.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures related to conflicts with biological policies or ordinances; the other two documents did not address impacts related to these issues, and none of the CEQA documents addressed impacts related to the consistency with relevant conservation plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could result in conflicts with applicable policies, ordinances, or conservation plans for a specific area to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would

involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. These facilities typically require outdoor lighting, smoke stacks, flares, and other industrial structures and could have the potential to affect biological resources located in the surrounding area. Therefore, these future heavy industrial facilities could have the potential of generating significant adverse impacts to biological resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.4-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on biological resources. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could result in changes to the habitat of protected species or impact biological policies and ordinances. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of biological impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Sensitive Species.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impact on sensitive species; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on sensitive species. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on biological resources, including sensitive plant and animal species.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to sensitive species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Riparian Habitat.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impact on riparian habitat; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on riparian habitat. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near sensitive riparian habitats to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Wetlands.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed no impacts on protected wetlands; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on wetlands. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near sensitive wetlands to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts to wetlands from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Movement of Native Species.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed no impacts on wildlife corridors or the movement of native species; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to the potential interference of native species. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a wildlife corridor that could result in habitat degradation, interference with movement of wildlife species or migratory fish, and impacts on migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites. These impacts may occur through grading or excavation, increases in water or air pollutants, increased noise, light, or vibration, interruption of fresh or salt water supplies, reduction in food supplies or foraging areas, or interference with established wildlife movement patterns on or between habitat areas to create significant adverse impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on wildlife corridors and related to the movement of native species from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Conflict with Policies, Ordinances, or Conservation Plans.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed no impacts related to conflicts with policies, ordinances, or applicable conservation plans regarding biological resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could result in conflicts with applicable policies, ordinances, or conservation plans for a specific area to create significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

Based on the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to biological resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to policies, ordinances, or conservation plans regarding biological resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents surveyed for the proposed project found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to biological resources that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documents found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts to sensitive species and the movement of native species. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to biological resources as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects." [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal credit accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per SB 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez), proposed Senate Bill (SB) 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill, which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal credit accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. Past development patterns within the district have resulted in a variety of environmental changes and development projects, many of which, as determined by the 52 CEQA documents described here, were found to have less-than-significant impacts on biological resources. Due to the wide distribution of wildlife, natural areas, and various biological resources within the district, the nature and scope of any potential biological impacts would typically be dependent on the specific location and physical nature of an individual project. As noted above, since the specific location and physical characteristics of individual facilities cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative biological impacts is even more uncertain.

Some of the projects surveyed were found to have significant unavoidable impacts, particularly in relation to (1) adverse effects on sensitive species, (2) interference with movement of native species, and (3) conflicts with biological policies and ordinances.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The respective FSAs prepared by the CEC concluded significant (unmitigated) biological impacts from the El Segundo project, no significant biological impacts from the Walnut Creek project and significant biological impacts mitigated to less than significant from the Sentinel project. According to the FSA prepared by the CEC for the El Segundo project there are adverse biological impacts to marine organisms from the use of water from Santa Monica Bay for once-through cooling, which could entrain, impinge and thermally effect fish and invertebrates. CEC staff recommended that mitigation be applied to avoid or significantly reduce the adverse biological impacts. According the El

Segundo FSA, the project proponents did not supply the sound scientific information on entrainment impacts that would be needed to develop appropriate mitigation, so specific mitigation measures could not be recommended for this project that would reduce the biological impacts to less than significant levels.

The Walnut Creek project will be located on existing industrial land that is entirely paved and does not contain any vegetation or habitat to support sensitive species, so, the CEC staff concluded there will not be a significant impact to biological resources from the construction of the plant. According to FSA for the Walnut Creek project, parking and equipment staging areas required during the construction period and new transmission lines will be located on previously disturbed sites containing no natural vegetation and provides no habitat to sensitive species. With regard to operation of the Walnut Creek project, CEC staff concluded that the proposed transmission lines will not pose a significant collision or electrocution threat to bird populations and the site is not known to be an optimal flight path, nor a high bird use area or migration route so the proposed exhaust stacks would not pose a significant collision threat to bird populations.

The FSA for the Sentinel project described the preparation of the site to include permanent removal of disturbed Sonoran creosote bush scrub and annual grassland and temporarily disturb these same vegetation communities and existing dirt roads in the construction laydown area and gas transmission corridor. The FSA determined that the habitats permanently removed are already degraded and provide limited wildlife use for regionally common species. However, construction activities could potentially disturb migratory or nesting birds. The FSA listed several mitigation measures in an effort to reduce construction related impacts to biological resources to less than significant. The mitigation measures include monitoring by a biologist, a worker environmental awareness program, and impact avoidance for desert tortoise, rare plants, and burrowing owls during pre-construction surveys. According to the FSA for Sentinel, potential operation-related impacts include impacts to birds due to collision with and/or electrocution by the transmission line, disturbance to wildlife due to increased noise and lighting, and loss of sensitive habitat through long-term groundwater use. Proposed mitigation listed in the FSA includes incorporating construction design recommendations, such as separating phase conductors and requiring that bird perch diverters and/or specifically designed avian protection materials should be used to cover electrical equipment where adequate separation is not feasible. With implementation of this mitigation, the CEC concluded that significant avian mortality due to electrocution by transmission structures is not expected to occur. Also, the CEC also determined no sensitive species were found in the project area that would be impacted by operational lighting, and while operation of the plant would produce elevated noise levels, no sensitive species would be impacted by additional noise are known to occur in the immediate vicinity. Finally, according to the FSA, implementation of groundwater replenishment in advance of construction and operation of the Sentinel project will reduce the potential significant and irreversible impacts to mesquite hummocks and the special-status species they support to less than significant.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)), and the proposed project

has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative biological resources impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Biological Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant biological resources impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse biological resources impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for biological resources impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of biological resources impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant biological resources impact, the potential exists for future indirect biological resources impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.5**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse impacts to cultural resources depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential indirect impacts of the proposed project on cultural resources from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential impacts to cultural resources is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed project. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse cultural resource impacts include assessments of impacts to designated historic resources (e.g., buildings listed on the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources, locally landmarked buildings, paleontological resources, and human remains) and scenic viewsheds of historic resources that may be caused by future new projects.

Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in the siting, construction, and operation of future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant impacts to cultural resources if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.
- Disturb a significant prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social group.
- Disturb unique paleontological resources by construction of the proposed project.
- Disturb human remains.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following is an evaluation of potential impacts to cultural resources from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on historic, archeological, and paleontological resources in a given area. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts to cultural resources is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

New or modified facilities could potentially result in removal of historic structures, alteration of historic structures and/or landscapes, built forms of a scale and with massing inconsistent with adjoining development, or destruction of archaeological and paleontological resources, including human remains. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse impacts to cultural resources have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to cultural resources as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include altering or destroying historic structures and historic open space and disturbing or destroying archaeological or paleontological resources. Construction of buildings on agricultural land previously undisturbed or minimally disturbed by agricultural production could result in the exposure and/or destruction of buried archaeological or paleontological remains, or expose human remains that are not buried within a cemetery. Therefore, the potential development of farm structures, dairy processing plants, and other agricultural-related structures may result in significant impacts to historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources and human remains.

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.5-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects could have on the various types of cultural resources, including adverse changes to historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains.

**TABLE 5.5-1  
Cultural Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                    |   |                                     |                          |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       | N – No impacts                                     |   |                                     |                          |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |  |   |                                     |                          |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination                         |   |                                     |                          |
|  | a) Result in adverse change to historical resource | b) Result in adverse change to archeological resource | c) Destroy paleontological resource | d) Disturb Human Remains |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>                                   |  |   |                                     |                          |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR                                    | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                               | LS   | LS  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                |  |   |                                     |                          |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                        | N  | N   | N                                   | N                        |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR                                  | LS   | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                   | S  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                               | S  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                    | LSM  | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                | S  | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                        | NE   | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | S  | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                               |  |   |                                     |                          |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel  | N  | N   | N                                   | N                        |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR                                     | N  | N   | N                                   | N                        |

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents were reviewed since they illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.5-1 (Continued)**  
**Cultural Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                    |   |                                     |                          |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       | N – No impacts                                     |   |                                     |                          |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |  |   |                                     |                          |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination                         |   |                                     |                          |
|  | a) Result in adverse change to historical resource | b) Result in adverse change to archeological resource | c) Destroy paleontological resource | d) Disturb Human Remains |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR                                 | N  | N   | N                                   | N                        |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                 | N  | N   | N                                   | N                        |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR                                  | NE   | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR                                  | LS   | LSM   | LS                                  | LS                       |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                            | N  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                     |  |   |                                     |                          |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR           | NE   | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR               | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LS                       |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR                                     | N  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                | LS   | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>                                  |  |   |                                     |                          |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR                         | S  | LSM   | NE                                  | NE                       |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                       | NE   | NE  | LSM                                 | NE                       |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                     | LS   | LS  | LS                                  | LS                       |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                    | LS   | LSM   | LSM                                 | LS                       |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR                              | N  | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR                              | N  | N   | N                                   | N                        |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR                         | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                    | NE   | LS  | LSM                                 | LS                       |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR                               | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR                               | N  | N   | N                                   | N                        |

**TABLE 5.5-1 (Continued)**  
**Cultural Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                       |                                     |                          |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   |  | N – No impacts  |                                     |                          |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |  |   |                                     |                          |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination                         |   |                                     |                          |
|  | a) Result in adverse change to historical resource | b) Result in adverse change to archeological resource | c) Destroy paleontological resource | d) Disturb Human Remains |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR  | LS   | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | N  | LSM   | LSM                                 | NE                       |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.  | N  | N   | N                                   | N                        |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | S  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | N  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |  |   |                                     |                          |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | N  | LSM   | S                                   | LSM                      |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LS   | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>  |  |   |                                     |                          |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | N  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | N  | N   | N                                   | N                        |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR  | NE   | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR                      | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| <b>Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities</b>   |  |   |                                     |                          |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR   | NE   | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR   | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                  | LSM                      |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR   | LS   | LSM   | LSM                                 | LSM                      |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR  | NE   | NE  | NE                                  | NE                       |

**TABLE 5.5-1 (Concluded)****Cultural Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |     |     |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | N   | N   | N   | N   |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LSM | LSM | LSM | LSM |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N   | N   | N   | N   |
| <p><sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.</li> <li>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.</li> </ol> <p>Source: ICF Jones &amp; Stokes, 2009.</p> |     |     |     |     |

Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities are typically constructed and operated within areas zoned for agriculture. These projects were found to have less-than-significant impacts (without and with mitigation) to cultural resources. The following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on cultural resources identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a) Historic Resources.** Both CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facilities category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on historical resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas where there are historic resources in the built environment that could be directly or indirectly affected by development.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on historic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) - d) Archaeological, Paleontological, Human Remains.** One of the two CEQA documents for past project in the agricultural facilities category disclosed less-than-significant impacts after implementation of mitigation measures on archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains. The other document found that impacts to archaeological resources would be less-than-significant but did not address impacts related to paleontological resources or human remains. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in

the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas where there are many resources, particularly those that are undisturbed in the ground, that could be disturbed by ground-breaking activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the last five years identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and, as such, the potential for alteration of historical resources would be high. The potential for disturbing archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains could be slightly lower because ground cover has likely been disturbed for previous projects. However, the potential for disturbing those resources would be significantly higher for new development on previously undisturbed land. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts on cultural resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.5-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on cultural resources, including adverse changes to historical resources, archaeological and paleontological resources, and the disturbance of human remains. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings, which were found to result in changes to the character of the immediate project area, ground-disturbing activities, removal or alteration of existing structures, and potential to uncover archaeological and/or paleontological resources and human remains. Project-specific impacts could be significant when the retail and service establishments surveyed are located in developed

urban areas near historic resources or use of the resource is part of the project. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on cultural resources identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Historic Resources.** Three of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facilities category found less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on historical resources; one of the eight documents did not address impacts to historic resources. However, for some projects surveyed, the CEQA documents concluded that the retail/service projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on historic resources, such as those disclosed for Projects # 5 - Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan, #6 – Archstone Hollywood, #8 – 1427 Fourth Street, and #10 – New Century Plan. These projects would involve either (1) the demolition of or result in a substantial change to contributors to locally-designated historic or potentially historic districts, or (2) the demolition of historic or potentially historic structures.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b, c, d) Archaeological, Paleontological, Human Remains.** Four of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facilities category disclosed less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impact on archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains; the other four CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas where there are many resources, particularly those that are undisturbed in the ground, that could be disturbed by ground-breaking activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented and, as such, these projects have the potential to alter or destroy historical resources. The potential for disturbing archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains could be low because ground cover has likely been disturbed for previous projects. However, the potential for disturbing those resources would be significantly higher for new development on previously undisturbed land. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more large commercial projects to have significant adverse impacts on cultural resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.5-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on cultural resources, including adverse changes to historical resources, archaeological and paleontological resources, and the disturbance of human remains. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found to result in changes to the character of the surrounding neighborhood, ground-disturbing activities, and potential to uncover archaeological and/or paleontological resources and human remains. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant because no designated historic resources were located in the project area. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on cultural resources identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Historic Resources.** Eight of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facilities category found less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation or no impacts on historical resources; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on historic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas where there are historic resources in the built environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b, c, d) Archaeological, Paleontological, Human Remains.** Eight of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facilities category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains; the other CEQA document did not

address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas where there are undisturbed resources in the ground that could be disturbed by ground-breaking activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, some of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities are anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to alter or destroy historical resources. The potential for disturbing archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains could be low because ground cover has likely been disturbed for previous projects. However, the potential for disturbing those resources would be significantly higher for new development on previously undisturbed land. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse impacts to cultural resources in the future.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.5-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on cultural resources, including adverse changes to historical resources, archaeological and paleontological resources, and the disturbance of human remains. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were not determined to destroy historic resources within the surrounding neighborhood. Accordingly, these projects were found to have less-than-significant impacts on cultural

resources. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Historic Resources.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facilities category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on historical resources; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts on historic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas where there are historic resources in the built environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on historic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Archaeological, Paleontological, Human Remains.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facilities category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas where there are undisturbed resources in the ground that could be disturbed by ground-breaking activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the last five years identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temples. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings and parking structures. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and therefore, there is a

potential for alteration or destruction of historical resources. The potential for disturbing archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains could be low because ground cover has likely been previously disturbed. However, the potential for disturbing those resources would be significantly higher for new development on previously undisturbed land. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse impacts on cultural resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.5-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on cultural resources, including adverse changes to historical resources, archaeological and paleontological resources, and the disturbance of human remains. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities. However, these projects were generally found to have less-than-significant impacts on cultural resources as most of these projects are located in developed urban areas, where designated historic resources would not be affected and ground material has already been impacted by prior development. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on cultural resources identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Historic Resources.** Eleven of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facilities category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts on historic resources; two CEQA documents did not address impacts on historic resources. However, for some projects surveyed, the CEQA documents concluded that the institutional projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on historic resources, such as those disclosed for Projects # 24 – Caltrans District 7 Headquarters and # 37 – Harvard-Westlake School. These projects would involve the demolition of historic or potentially historic structures that have been determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register or the California Register.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on historic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Archaeological, Paleontological, Human Remains.** Fourteen of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facilities category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts on archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on

SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in the institutional facility category could be sited in areas where there are many resources, particularly those that are undisturbed in the ground, that could be disturbed by ground-breaking activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in the movement of goods, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting. However, any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas. Accordingly, the potential for alteration or destruction of historical resources is low. The potential for disturbing archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains could be slightly lower because ground cover has likely been disturbed for previous projects. However, the potential for disturbing those resources would be significantly higher for new development on previously undisturbed land. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more transportation projects to have significant adverse impacts on cultural resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.5-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on cultural resources, including adverse changes to historical resources, archaeological and paleontological resources, and the disturbance of

human remains. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, and bus storage and maintenance facilities, some of which were found to result in the removal of some existing buildings and ground disturbance. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant because no designated historic resources were located in the project area. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on cultural resources identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Historic Resources.** Three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facilities category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on historical resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in the transportation facilities category could be sited in areas where there are historic resources in the built environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on historic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b, c, d) Archaeological, Paleontological, Human Remains.** The CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facilities category disclosed less-than-significant impacts with mitigation for archeological and paleontological resources and human remains. However, for one project surveyed, the lead agency concluded that the transportation project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on paleontological resources, such as those disclosed for Project #39 – TraPac Terminal Expansion. For this project, it was determined that any vertebrate fossils exposed by grading without appropriate professional, systematic recovery would be destroyed, resulting in significant impacts on paleontological resources.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities are not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks,

digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities are not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades, and improvement to existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Although these facilities would typically be constructed in industrial zoned areas, these facilities may be sited near or directly adjacent to sensitive cultural resources. Accordingly, there is a potential for alteration or destruction of historical resources. The potential for disturbing archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains could be low because ground cover has likely been disturbed for previous projects. However, the potential for disturbing those resources would be significantly higher for new development on previously undisturbed land. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more utility projects to generate significant adverse cultural impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.5-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on cultural resources, including changes to historical, archaeological and paleontological resources, and human remains. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts because no designated historic resources were located in the project area. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on cultural resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Historic Resources.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility projects category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impacts on historic resources; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts on historic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in the transportation facilities category could be sited in areas where there are historic resources in the built environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant.

Therefore, impacts on historic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Archaeological, Paleontological, Human Remains.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility projects category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impact on archeological and paleontological resources and human remains; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas where there are undisturbed resources in the ground that could be disturbed by ground-breaking activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings within existing light-industrial settings and would have the potential for alteration or destruction of historical resources. The potential for disturbing archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains could be low because ground cover has likely been disturbed for previous projects. However, the potential for disturbing those resources would be significantly higher for new development on previously undisturbed land. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more light industrial/warehouse projects to have significant adverse impacts on cultural resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.5-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on cultural resources, including changes to historical, archaeological and paleontological resources, and human remains. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the

construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures for the projects would not cause significant adverse effects on cultural resources because most of these facilities were located in developed urban industrial areas, where designated historic buildings were not located nearby and ground material has already been impacted by prior development. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on cultural resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Historic Resources.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse projects category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on historic resources; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts on historic resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in the light industrial/warehouse project category could be sited in areas where there are historic resources in the built environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on historic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Archaeological, Paleontological, Human Remains.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facilities category found that there would be less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on archeological and paleontological resources and human remains; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts on these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in the institutional facility category could be sited in areas where there are many resources, particularly those that are undisturbed in the ground, that could be disturbed by ground-breaking activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to

involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. The potential of disturbing existing historic structures could be high. The potential of disturbing archaeological and paleontological resources, and human remains, could be slightly lower, because ground cover has likely been disturbed for previous projects. However, the potential of disturbing those resources would be significantly higher for new construction starts on previously undisturbed land. Therefore, heavy industrial facilities would generally have a high likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts to cultural resources in the future.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.5-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on cultural resources, including adverse changes to historical resources, archaeological and paleontological resources, and the disturbance of human remains. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities would not result in significant changes to any historic resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of cultural resource impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Historic Resources.** The CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facilities category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impacts on historical resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in the heavy industrial facilities category could be sited in areas where there are historic resources in the built environment.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on historic resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Archaeological, Paleontological, Human Remains.** The CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facilities category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impacts on

archeological and paleontological resources and human remains. Based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas where there are undisturbed resources in the ground that could be disturbed by ground-breaking activities.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts on cultural resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to cultural resources that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documentation found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts on historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources.

Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to cultural resources as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects." [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal credit accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill 827; and

- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez) and proposed SB 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal credit accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. Cumulative development in the district could result in the substantial adverse modification or destruction of historic buildings, which could contribute to the degradation of the historic and architectural fabric of certain areas of the district. However, it is anticipated that development of future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts that could potentially affect historic resources or structures will be subject to the requirements of CEQA and other applicable legal requirements, and that the impacts of cumulative development on historic resources will be mitigated to the extent feasible, which could include compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards and guidelines and consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office. Nevertheless, it would be speculative to anticipate when, or if, such development would occur and whether any, or all, impacts to historic resources could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Similarly, development of future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts may require grading and excavation that could potentially affect archaeological or paleontological resources or human remains. The cumulative effect of these projects would contribute to the continued loss of subsurface cultural resources if these resources are not protected upon discovery. If subsurface cultural resources are protected upon discovery as required by law, cumulative impacts to those resources would be less than significant. However, it would be speculative to anticipate when, or if, such development would occur and whether any, or all, impacts to cultural resources could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Given the decreasing number of historical and archaeological and paleontological resources present within the district due to on-going development and urbanization, cumulative impacts on cultural resources as a result of future development throughout the district is expected to be significant.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The FSAs prepared by the CEC for the El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects determined the cultural resources impacts are not significant, and the FSA for the Sentinel project concluded the potential significant cultural resources impacts could be

mitigated to less than significant. According to the FSA for the El Segundo project, project-related site development and construction would entail ground disturbance so the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect previously unknown cultural resources. However, the CEC concluded the proposed power plant location yielded no physical evidence of cultural resources. The CEC also concluded the use of secondary treated water would require pipeline construction and because archaeological sites are present in the vicinity, cultural resource surveys would need to be conducted and cultural resource monitoring recommended along the entire pipeline route until the end of pipeline ground disturbance. According to the CEC, no additional built environment or archaeological resources were identified as a result of the cultural resource survey of the parking lots adjacent to the proposed waterline route, and existing pipelines will be used to deliver natural gas.

CEC staff determined that the Walnut Creek project would have no impact on known significant archaeological resources, historic standing structures, or ethnographic resources. According to the FSA for the Walnut Creek project, the potential for newly discovered archaeological sites during ground disturbance would be mitigated by measures to impact levels below significance. Such measures include: designating a cultural resources specialist; conducting a construction worker training program; monitoring initial clearing and excavation; halting construction if there is a discovery of an archaeological site or human remains; recording and evaluating a discovery; and reporting the findings. CEC staff identified no indirect impacts to any known cultural resources in the impact area of the Walnut Creek project and, therefore, required no mitigation measures for indirect impacts for any class of cultural resources.

Archaeological surveys conducted in 2007 of the proposed Sentinel project area identified four archaeological sites and one isolate according to the FSA for the Sentinel project. The cultural resources were discovered along the proposed pipeline routes and the proposed plant site. The FSA stated the four sites are all historic-period and include refuse scatters and one collapsed/demolished concrete building, and the one isolate was composed of three brownware fragments. The CEC staff determined only one of these structures would have been directly impacted by the construction activities of the proposed project and provided measures in case any additional archaeological resources are discovered during construction on the main plant site, such as requiring identification, assessment, and mitigation sufficient to reduce the significance of the project's impacts to negligible, if such discovered resources are assessed as significant. Mitigation listed in the FSA included the following: the project be located at the greatest possible distance from any known cultural resources; fencing or some other type of physical demarcation be used if cultural resource is identified; a program of crew education; archaeological monitoring; and formal compliance with CEQA or National Environmental Policy Act if a cultural resource cannot be avoided. The FSA concluded no significant standing historic structures were identified in the area within one mile of the Sentinel project, so no impact to the integrity of setting, association, or feeling of any such resources in the surrounding area would result from the proposed project. Finally, the CEC concluded no ethnographic resources, either previously recorded or newly disclosed in the communications with Native Americans, were identified in the vicinity of the project, and

no indirect impacts to cultural resources in the impact area were identified so no mitigation of indirect impacts would be required for any class of cultural resources.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative cultural resources impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Cultural Resources Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant cultural resources impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse cultural resources impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for cultural resources impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of cultural resources impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant cultural resources impact, the potential exists for future indirect cultural resources impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.6**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - ENERGY**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to result in adverse impacts on energy resources, depending upon the nature of the project. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential impacts on energy resources that may result from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential impacts to energy resources is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed project in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse indirect impacts to energy resources include assessments of impacts related to conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies, effects on peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards, that may be caused by future new projects.

Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant impacts to energy resources if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- The project would conflict with adopted energy conservation plans or standards.
- The project would result in substantial depletion of existing energy resource supplies.

- An increase in demand for utilities would impact the current capacities of the electric and natural gas utilities.
- The project would use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and/or inefficient manner.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential energy resource impacts from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on energy resources in the district. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of energy resource impacts is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only. Construction and operation of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse impacts on energy resources. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in energy resource impacts in the event that development projects or existing facility modifications occur in areas within the district, where additional supplies of electrical power and natural gas are in great demand. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse energy resource impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Energy Resource Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to reevaluate existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to energy resources as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include increased energy use for agricultural operations, such as harvesting equipment, dairies, food processing, or related operations, such as

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

winery facilities. Agricultural operations typically have a low geographic density, and, therefore, any projected increase in energy demand would be relatively low. Nonetheless, due to the unknown nature of any specific future agricultural projects, significant impacts to energy resources may occur. Further, the combined effect of all the projects may potentially be significant.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.6-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on energy resources, including conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural facilities typically have a low geographic density, and, therefore, any projected increase in energy demand would be relatively low. These projects were found to have less-than-significant energy resource impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on energy identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, e) Energy Conservation Plans, Energy Standards.** The two CEQA documents did not reveal any conflicts with energy conservation plans, or energy standards for past projects in the agricultural facility category. Neither of the two CEQA documents addressed impacts related to conflicts with energy conservation plans. While all newly constructed facilities would be expected to comply with any existing energy conservation plans and standards, it is possible that future individual agricultural projects could conflict with established energy conservation standards, either inadvertently, or cumulatively.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, indirect impacts on energy conservation plans and standards as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents were reviewed since they illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.6-1**  
**Energy Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |   |  |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| S – Significant   |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>  |   |  |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |   | N – No impacts   |   |  |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |   |  |   |  |   |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b>                         |  |   |  |   |
|   | <b>a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans</b> | <b>b) Need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems</b> | <b>c) Create significant effects on local or regional energy supplies, or require additional energy</b> | <b>d) Create significant effects on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy</b> | <b>e) Comply with existing energy standards</b> |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>  |   |  |   |  |   |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR   | NE  | NE   | LS  | LS   | NE  |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                                      | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                       |   |  |   |  |   |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                               | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS  |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                          | NE  | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS  |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                                      | LS  | LSM  | LSM   | LSM  | NE  |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                           | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                       | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                               | NE  | N  | LS  | LS   | LS  |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR  | NE  | N  | LS  | LS   | NE  |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                                      |   |  |   |  |   |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel EIR   | NE  | NE   | LS  | LS   | NE  |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR  | NE  | NE   | LS  | LS   | NE  |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR  | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                        | NE  | NE   | LS  | LS   | NE  |

**TABLE 5.6-1 (Continued)**  
**Energy Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant<br>LS – Less-than-Significant<br>LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup><br>N – No impacts               |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination                         |   |  |   |  |
|  | a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans | b) Need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems | c) Create significant effects on local or regional energy supplies, or require additional energy | d) Create significant effects on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy | e) Comply with existing energy standards |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | NE   | NE  | LS   | LS  | NE                                       |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR  | NE   | N   | N  | N   | N  |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR  | NE   | LS  | LS   | LS  | NE                                       |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR  | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR  | LS   | LSM   | LSM  | LSM   | LS                                       |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>   |  |   |  |   |  |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR                                       | NE   | LS  | LS   | LS  | NE                                       |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR   | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR   | LS   | LS  | NE   | NE  | LS                                       |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR  | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>  |  |   |  |   |  |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR   | NE   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR   | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR   | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR  | NE   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |

**TABLE 5.6-1 (Continued)**  
**Energy Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                                 |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   |  | N – No impacts  |  |   |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |  |   |  |   |  |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination                         |   |  |   |  |
|  | a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans | b) Need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems | c) Create significant effects on local or regional energy supplies, or require additional energy | d) Create significant effects on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy | e) Comply with existing energy standards |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR   | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR   | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | NE   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | NE   | NE  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | NE   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |  |   |  |   |  |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | NE   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | NE   | NE  | NE   | LS  | NE                                       |
| <b>Utility Projects (Includes Power Plants)</b>  |  |   |  |   |  |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | NE   | N/Beneficial Impact   | N/Beneficial Impact  | N/Beneficial Impact   | NE                                       |

**TABLE 5.6-1 (Concluded)**  
**Energy Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant<br>LS – Less-than-Significant<br>LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup><br>N – No impacts               |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed  | Significance Determination                         |   |  |   |  |
|   | a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans | b) Need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems | c) Create significant effects on local or regional energy supplies, or require additional energy | d) Create significant effects on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy | e) Comply with existing energy standards |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR  | N  | N   | LS   | N/Beneficial Impact   | N  |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR   | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR   | NE   | NE  | LS   | LS  | NE                                       |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>  |  |   |  |   |  |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | NE   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | NE   | NE  | LS   | LS  | NE                                       |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | NE   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS                                       |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |  |   |  |   |  |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | N  | N/Beneficial Impact   | LS   | N/Beneficial Impact   | LS                                       |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE  | NE                                       |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N  | N   | N  | N   | N  |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br><br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |  |   |  |   |  |

**b, c, d) Require New or Altered Power Utilities, Require New Energy Supplies, Increased Demand for Energy.** Two CEQA documents for new or altered power utilities for past projects in the agricultural facility category. Neither of the two CEQA documents specifically addressed impacts related to the need for new or altered power utilities. The Clos de la Tech Winery project disclosed a less-than-significant impact related to requirements for new energy supplies, as well as a less-than-significant impact related to an increased demand for energy. However, it is possible that future individual agricultural projects could have a significant adverse effect or cumulatively impact the available capacity of existing power utilities, and due to increased demand, may require additional electrical and fuel energy sources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, indirect impacts related to requirements for new or altered power utilities, new energy supplies, or an overall increased demand for energy as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas with existing energy supply services.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the last five years. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential for resulting in substantially increased energy use or increased pressure on energy supplies. Furthermore, it would be expected that all future development projects would generally conform to all established energy conservation plans and energy standards. Therefore, individual retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts on energy resources in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts. In addition, the combined effect of all the projects may potentially be significant.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.6-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on energy

resources, including conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings, which were found to result in projected increased operational energy consumption. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts as most retail and service establishments surveyed are located in developed urban areas with sufficient energy supply services, and would conform to established energy conservation plans and standards. Typically, these projects would either replace previous developments or would not require substantial new amounts of energy. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on energy identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, e) Energy Conservation Plans, Energy Standards.** Two of the eight CEQA documents disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to conflicts with energy conservation plans for past projects in the retail/service facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts, while three of the eight CEQA documents disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to impacts on energy standards. While all newly constructed facilities would be expected to comply with any existing energy conservation plans and standards, to the extent that affected equipment are subject to energy conservation standard, it is possible that future individual retail/service projects could conflict with established energy conservation plans and standards, either individually or cumulatively.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy conservation plans and standards as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Require New or Altered Power Utilities, Require New Energy Supplies, Increased Demand for Energy.** Five of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts regarding these issues. However, future projects in the retail/service facility category may have characteristics that may require increased energy demands that are different from those reviewed for this PEA, that could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy resources related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies,

and increased demand for energy resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas with existing energy supply services.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting, the construction and operation of all of which may result in the consumption of substantial amounts of energy. However, based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would likely have access to existing energy utility infrastructure, and would conform to all applicable energy conservation plans and standards. Furthermore, newly constructed or renovated facilities would be expected to have more efficient energy use technology than that which was previously installed and, therefore, may actually reduce overall energy use. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts to energy resources. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant impacts. Moreover, the potential exists for the project as a whole to have significant energy impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.6-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on energy resources, including conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found to result in less-than-significant impacts to energy resources. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts since most of the commercial facilities are located in developed urban areas and would have access to existing energy utility infrastructure, would be in conformity with applicable energy plans, and would be expected to result in improvements to energy efficiency as compared to previous facilities. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on energy identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, e) Energy Conservation Plans, Energy Standards.** Two of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to conflicts with energy conservation plans and energy standards; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy conservation plans and standards as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Require New or Altered Power Utilities, Require New Energy Supplies, Increased Demand for Energy.** The CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed impacts related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy that were either less-than-significant (without or with mitigation), no impact, or impacts were not discussed in the CEQA documents.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy resources related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, a some of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities are anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities, the construction and operation of all of which may result in the consumption of substantial amounts of energy. However, all such facilities would be expected to conform to all applicable energy conservation plans and standards. Furthermore, newly constructed or renovated facilities would be expected to have more efficient energy use technology than that which was previously installed and, therefore, may actually reduce overall energy use. However, due the large scale of some such facilities (NFL stadiums, etc.), it is likely that a substantial new energy demand may occur. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse energy resource impacts. Moreover, the potential

exists for the project as a whole (including all categories of facilities) to have a significant energy impact.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.6-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on energy resources, including conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, outdoor lighting, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were generally determined to have a less-than-significant impact related to energy resources. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of impacts on energy identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, e) Energy Conservation Plans, Energy Standards.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to conflicts with energy conservation plans and energy standards; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy conservation plans and standards as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Require New or Altered Power Utilities, Require New Energy Supplies, Increased Demand for Energy.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy resources related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and

increased demand for energy resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting, the construction and operation of all of which may result in the consumption of substantial amounts of energy. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and would, therefore, be unlikely to require new energy utility or delivery infrastructure. All such facilities would be expected to conform to all applicable energy conservation plans and standards. Furthermore, newly constructed or renovated facilities would be expected to have more efficient energy use technology than that which was previously installed and, therefore, may actually reduce overall energy use. As such, these future facilities would have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse energy resource impacts. Moreover, the potential exists for the project as a whole (including all categories of facilities) to have a significant impact.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.6-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on energy resources, including conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities, which were generally determined to have a less-than-significant impact, or did not discuss impacts related to energy resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on energy identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, e) Energy Conservation Plans, Energy Standards.** Five of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed less than significant impacts related to energy standards; the other 10 documents did not

address impacts related to such issue, and none of the CEQA documents discussed impacts related to energy conservation plans.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy conservation plans and standards as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Require New or Altered Power Utilities, Require New Energy Supplies, Increased Demand for Energy.** Five of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy; the other 10 CEQA documents did not discuss these topics.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy resources related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting, all of which may result in considerable amounts of new energy use. However, any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would, therefore, have access to existing energy utility infrastructure. Furthermore, all such facilities would be expected to conform to all applicable energy conservation plans and standards.

Nevertheless, the potential exists for one or more future transportation projects to have significant impacts on energy resources. Moreover, the potential exists for the project as a whole (including all categories of facilities) to have a significant energy impact.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.6-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on energy resources, including conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, bus storage and maintenance facilities, and mixed-use residential and commercial facilities, which were found to have less-than-significant impacts or did not discuss impacts related to energy resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on energy identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, e) Energy Conservation Plans, Energy Standards.** One of the three CEQA documents for a past project in the transportation facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact related to energy standards; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to such issue, and none of the CEQA documents discussed impacts related to energy conservation plans.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy conservation plans and standards as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Require New or Altered Power Utilities, Require New Energy Supplies, Increased Demand for Energy.** One of the three CEQA documents for a past project in the transportation facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy; the other two documents did not address impacts related to such issue.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy resources related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. These facilities would typically be constructed in industrial zoned areas with sufficient access to existing power utility infrastructure. Additionally, it is likely that operation of some of these utility projects (e.g., power plants) would increase the available amount of electricity for use in the electrical grid system. Other types of utility projects, such as water treatment, sewage, and solid waste treatment facilities may result in substantially increased energy demands. Accordingly, a number of conflicts may occur regarding energy resources. Therefore, future construction and operation of one or more utility facilities could generate significant adverse energy resource impacts. Moreover, the potential exists for the project as a whole (including all categories of facilities) to have a significant energy impact.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.6-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on energy resources, including conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. However, based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, would have a low likelihood for impacts on energy resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on energy identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, e) Energy Conservation Plans, Energy Standards.** One of the four CEQA documents for a past project in the utility facility category disclosed no impacts related to energy conservation plans and standards; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to such issues.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time

the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy conservation plans and standards as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Require New or Altered Power Utilities, Require New Energy Supplies, Increased Demand for Energy.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either beneficial impacts, less-than-significant impacts, or no impacts related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts related to such issues. Two projects (Projects #42 – El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project and #43 – LADWP Electric Generating Stations Modifications) were determined to have a beneficial impact on energy resources. Additionally, it is foreseeable that newly constructed public utilities, particularly power utilities, would require new energy (fuel) delivery systems in order to operate and, therefore, could potentially have a significant impact related to energy supplies.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy resources related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas with adequate power utility infrastructure services.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility, for all of which construction and operation activities would potentially require substantial amounts of new energy. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings that could require outdoor lighting and moderate amounts of construction activities, which may result in significant adverse energy resource impacts. Moreover, the potential exists for the project as a whole (including all categories of facilities) to have a significant energy impact.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table

5.6-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on energy resources, including conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in increased energy demands. However, adverse effects were not found to be significant since these facilities are located in existing developed urban areas with adequate access to energy utility infrastructure, and would not result in substantial increases in energy demand. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on energy identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, e) Energy Conservation Plans, Energy Standards.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industry/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to energy standards; the other two documents did not address impacts related to such issue, and none of the CEQA documents discussed impacts related to energy conservation plans.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy conservation plans and standards as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Require New or Altered Power Utilities, Require New Energy Supplies, Increased Demand for Energy.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industry/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy resources related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas, the construction and operation of all of which could potentially result in substantial new energy demands. Accordingly, it is likely that these types of project would have significant impact related to conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. Therefore, these future heavy industrial facilities have the potential of generating significant adverse energy resource impacts. Moreover, the potential exists for the project as a whole (including all categories of facilities) to have a significant energy impact.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.6-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on energy resources, including conflicts with energy conservation plans, the need for new or altered power or natural gas utility systems, effects on local or regional energy supplies or peak and base period energy demands, and conflicts with existing energy standards. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction and operation of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could result in increased demands on energy resources. Nonetheless, the surveyed projects generally found impacts to be less-than-significant or no impact to energy resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on energy identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, e) Energy Conservation Plans, Energy Standards.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impact related to energy conservation plans and standards; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts related to such issues.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy conservation plans and standards as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c, d) Require New or Altered Power Utilities, Require New Energy Supplies, Increased Demand for Energy.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either beneficial impacts or no impacts related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and

increased demand for energy; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts related to such issues. One project (Project #50 – Chevron Products Company) would potentially result in a net benefit for energy supplies due to improvements at an oil refinery.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the additional considerations identified in the preceding paragraph, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to energy could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy resources related to the need for new power utilities, new energy supplies, and increased demand for energy resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to energy resources that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, considering the potential impacts of the project as a whole, exercising SCAQMD staff’s independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to energy resources as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other “past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects” [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal credit accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez) and proposed SB 388 (Calderon), which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for

certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal credit accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. The construction and operation of many past development projects have resulted in new or different demands for energy resources. As compared to past and pending projects, future projects would likely include design features and equipment with higher levels of energy efficiency, in addition to distributed renewable and alternative energy generation capacities (solar, wind, co-generation technologies), which may result in beneficial cumulative impacts relative to the overall energy supply. While most projects would be expected to conform to existing adopted energy conservation plans and standards, incremental development of various types of new facilities, as discussed above, would likely result in net-positive demands for additional energy generation, transmission, and storage capacity. The current electrical generation and fuel supply infrastructure is limited, and in some regions at or near full capacity during peak periods. Therefore, any increase in demand would have the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts.

None of the past projects were specifically identified as having the potential to have significant adverse energy resource impacts. However, since the specific amount of new energy resources demands and the types of new future development projects cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of energy resource impacts is even more uncertain.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The FSAs prepared by the CEC for both the El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects concluded that energy impacts would be not significant and the FSA determined the significant energy impacts from the Sentinel would be mitigated to less than significant. Energy impacts include conflict with adopted energy conservation plans; result in the need for new or altered power utility system; or create significant effects on local or regional energy supplies or require additional energy. For example, the CEC staff concludes that no significant additional new transmission facilities, other than those proposed by the El Segundo project, are required to meet the reliability criteria of North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC), Western Systems Coordinating Council (WSCC), and California Independent System Operator (Cal-ISO). CEC staff addressed the issue of inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy to determine if

the project's consumption of energy creates a significant adverse impact. The FSA prepared by the CEC determined the project will burn natural gas from the existing Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) pipeline, whose infrastructure is extensive, so highly unlikely that the project could pose a substantial increase in demand for natural gas in California. In addition, the CEC concluded there is no real likelihood that the El Segundo project will require the development of additional energy supply capacity because SoCalGas claims that their pipeline should provide adequate access to natural gas fuel. According to the FSA, the El Segundo project would generate 630 MW of electric power at an overall project fuel efficiency around 55 percent. CEC staff concludes that while the project will consume substantial amounts of energy, it will do so in the most efficient manner practicable; it will not create significant adverse effects on energy supplies or resources; will not require additional sources of energy supply; will not consume energy in a wasteful or inefficient manner; and no energy standards would apply to the project. Thus, CEC staff concluded that the El Segundo project would present no significant adverse impacts upon energy resources.

According to the Walnut Creek FSA, power plants are high value gas consumers so should gas supplies or gas transport capacity fall short, power plants would not be curtailed until after most or all industrial and commercial users had been curtailed. The FSA claims that given SoCalGas's extensive system and its drive to continually improve its supply and delivery capabilities, CEC staff does not envision the project suffering significant risk of gas supply curtailment. The CEC concluded that the SoCalGas gas supply system should prove an adequate source for a project of Walnut Creek's size, so it highly unlikely that the project could pose a significant adverse impact on natural gas supplies in California. The Walnut Creek project would generate a nominal 500 MW of peaking electric power at an overall project fuel efficiency of 41.75 percent lower heating value (LHV) at maximum full load. While it will consume substantial amounts of energy, according to the FSA for Walnut Creek, there are no alternatives that could significantly reduce energy consumption. The CEC concluded the Walnut Creek project will consume energy in the most efficient manner practicable; will not create significant adverse effects on energy supplies or resources; will not require additional sources of energy supply; will not consume energy in a wasteful or inefficient manner; and no energy standards would apply to the project. Therefore CEC staff concluded that the Walnut Creek project would present no significant adverse impacts upon energy resources.

According to the CEC, the Sentinel project could be deemed to create significant adverse impacts on energy resources if alternatives existed that would reduce the project's use of fuel. However, CEC staff agreed with the applicant in choosing the General Electric LMS100 gas turbine generator as the most fuel efficient; employing evaporative inlet air cooling and evaporative compressor interstage cooling; and using natural gas burning technologies because they are most feasible. Similar to El Segundo and Walnut Creek, the Sentinel project will use the SoCalGas natural gas system, which has access to gas from the Rocky Mountains, Canada and the Southwest representing a resource of considerable capacity and an adequate source for the Sentinel project. Thus, the CEC concluded in the Sentinel FSA that it is highly unlikely that the project could pose a significant adverse impact on natural gas supplies in California. Further, according to the FSA, the existing SoCalGas natural gas transmission pipeline is a resource with adequate

delivery capacity so there is no real likelihood that the Sentinel project would require the development of additional energy supply capacity. If constructed and operated as proposed, the Sentinel project would generate a nominal 779 MW of peaking electric power at an overall project fuel efficiency of 42 percent LHV at maximum full load and average annual ambient conditions. The CEC concluded that while the Sentinel project would consume substantial amounts of energy, it would do so in the most efficient manner practicable; would not create significant adverse effects on energy supplies or resources; would not require additional sources of energy supply; would not consume energy in a wasteful or inefficient manner; and no energy standards would apply to the project. CEC staff, therefore, concluded that the project would present no significant adverse impacts upon energy resources.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative energy impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Energy Resource Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant energy impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts that are outside of its jurisdictional authority is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse energy impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for energy impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of energy impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant energy impact, the potential exists for future indirect energy impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.7**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse impacts related to geology and soils depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential indirect impacts the proposed project would have related to geology and soils from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential impacts related to geology and soils is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed project in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse geology and soils impacts include assessments of impacts due to exposure of people and structures to adverse geological effects, soil erosion or loss of top soil, location on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. The analysis also includes identification of impacts due to the location of a facility on expansive soils or on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, where sewer service is not available.

Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant geology and soils impacts if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- Exposure of people or structures to major geologic hazards such as earthquake surface rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction or landslides.
- Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.
- Be located on unstable or expansive soil.
- Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential geology and soils impacts related to future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have related to the geology and soils of a given area. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts related to geology and soils is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse geology and soils impacts. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in geology and soil impacts if they occur along active faults, thus, being subject to seismic events like surface fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslides. The individual project could also result in impacts by causing soil erosion or loss of top soil, or being located on expansive or unstable soils that might lead to ground failure. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse geology and soils impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Geology and Soils Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to reevaluate existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts related to geology and soils as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include potentially locating facilities in areas of known faults, such that people and structures are exposed to seismic effects, resulting in soil erosion or loss of top soil, exposing facilities to landslides and liquefaction, and locating project in areas with expansive soils, which could result in ground failure. Depending on the location of the individual facilities, the individual agricultural facilities may result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.7-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have related to geology and soils, including seismic effects, effects from soil erosion or loss of top soil, and effects of unstable and expansive soils. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities may occur along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by seismic activities, such as surface fault rupture, relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landslides. Individual projects may also be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant geology and soils impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, c) Expose people or structures to adverse seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence, etc.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to the exposure of people and structures to geological effects. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near or along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by surface fault rupture due to seismic activity. During an earthquake on these active or potentially active faults within the district, potential surface rupture of the fault may result in relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface. Individual agricultural facilities could be located in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides, unstable soil conditions causing subsidence, lateral spreading, or liquefaction.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.7-1**  
**Geology and Soils Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|  |  |  |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>              |  |   |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       |  | N – No impacts                               |  |   |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |  |  |  |   |   |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination   |  |  |   |   |
|  | a)Expose people or structures to adverse geological effects (i-iv) | b) Result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil | c)Located on unstable soil and potentially result in landslide, liquefaction | d)Located on expansive soil as defined in Uniform Building Code | e) Have soils incapable of supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>                                   |  |  |  |   |   |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR                                    | LS   | LSM  | LS   | N   | N   |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                               | LS   | LS   | LS   | LS  | NE  |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                |  |  |  |   |   |
| 3. Med. Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                           | LS   | LS   | N  | N   | N   |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR                                  | LS   | LSM  | LS   | LSM   | N   |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                   | LSM  | LSM  | LSM  | LSM   | N   |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                               | LSM  | LSM  | LS   | LS  | N   |
| 7. 2001 Main St. Mixed Use Dev. EIR                              | LS   | LS   | LS   | LS  | N   |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Exp. EIR                             | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | LSM   | N   |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | LS   | LSM  | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                               |  |  |  |   |   |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel  | LS   | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR                                     | LSM  | LS   | LS   | LS  | N   |

**TABLE 5.7-1 (Continued)**  
**Geology and Soils Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>              |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       |  | N – No impacts                               |  |   |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |  |  |  |   |   |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination   |  |  |   |   |
|  | a)Expose people or structures to adverse geological effects (i-iv) | b) Result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil | c)Located on unstable soil and potentially result in landslide, liquefaction | d)Located on expansive soil as defined in Uniform Building Code | e) Have soils incapable of supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR                                 | LS   | LS   | LS   | LS  | N   |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                 | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | LSM  | LSM  | LS   | LS  | N   |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR                                  | LSM  | LSM  | LSM  | LSM   | N   |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR                                  | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                            | LS   | LSM  | LS   | LSM   | N   |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                | LSM  | LS   | LS   | LS  | N   |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                     |  |  |  |   |   |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR           | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR               | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR                                     | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | N   | LS  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                | S  | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>                                  |  |  |  |   |   |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR                         | LSM  | LSM  | LSM  | LS  | N   |

**TABLE 5.7-1 (Continued)**  
**Geology and Soils Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>              |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       |  | N – No impacts                               |  |   |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |  |  |  |   |   |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination   |  |  |   |   |
|  | a)Expose people or structures to adverse geological effects (i-iv) | b) Result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil | c)Located on unstable soil and potentially result in landslide, liquefaction | d)Located on expansive soil as defined in Uniform Building Code | e) Have soils incapable of supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                       | LSM  | LS   | LS   | LS  | N   |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                     | LS   | LS   | LS   | LS  | N   |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                    | LS   | LS   | LSM  | LS  | LS  |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR                              | LS   | LS   | LS   | LS  | N   |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR                              | LSM  | LSM  | N  | N   | N   |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR                         | LSM  | LSM  | LSM  | N   | N   |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                    | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR                               | LS   | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR                               | LS   | LS   | LS   | LS  | N   |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR            | LSM  | LSM  | LSM  | LSM   | N   |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LSM  | LSM  | LSM  | LSM   | N   |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.                    | LS   | N  | LS   | LS  | N   |

**TABLE 5.7-1 (Continued)**  
**Geology and Soils Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>              |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   |  | N – No impacts                               |  |   |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |  |  |  |   |   |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination   |  |  |   |   |
|  | a)Expose people or structures to adverse geological effects (i-iv) | b) Result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil | c)Located on unstable soil and potentially result in landslide, liquefaction | d)Located on expansive soil as defined in Uniform Building Code | e) Have soils incapable of supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | LSM  | LS   | LS   | LS  | N   |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | LSM   | N   |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |  |  |  |   |   |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | S  | LS   | S  | LS  | N   |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | LSM  | LSM  | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LSM  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>  |  |  |  |   |   |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | LSM  | LSM  | LSM  | LSM   | N   |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | LSM  | LS   | LSM  | LS  | N   |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR  | LS   | LSM  | LS   | N   | N   |

**TABLE 5.7-1 (Concluded)**  
**Geology and Soils Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |   |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| S – Significant   |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                     |   |  |  |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |   | N – No impacts                                      |   |  |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |   |   |   |  |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>   | <b>Significance Determination</b>   |   |   |  |  |
|   | <b>a)Expose people or structures to adverse geological effects (i-iv)</b> | <b>b) Result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil</b> | <b>c)Located on unstable soil and potentially result in landslide, liquefaction</b> | <b>d)Located on expansive soil as defined in Uniform Building Code</b> | <b>e) Have soils incapable of supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems</b> |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR   | LSM   | LSM   | LSM   | LS   | N  |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>  |   |   |   |  |  |
| 46. Lantana Studio Dev. Project EIR   | LSM   | LSM   | LSM   | LSM  | N  |
| 47. Alessandro Bus. Ctr. Project EIR  | LS  | LSM   | LS  | N  | N  |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | LSM   | LS  | LSM   | LS   | N  |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | LS  | LS  | LS  | LS   | N  |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |   |   |   |  |  |
| 50. Chevron Products Co. El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | LS  | LS  | LS  | LS   | N  |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LS  | LS  | LS  | LS   | LS   |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N   | N   | N   | N  | N  |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |   |   |   |  |  |

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, and subsidence, from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Soil erosion or loss of top soil.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to soil erosion or loss of top soil. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could result in soil erosion or loss of top soil due to wind and water erosion of areas with exposed soil and through surface run-off during irrigation and construction activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of top soil from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d, e) Expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste water disposal.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts due to expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste disposal systems. For one of the documents, impacts related to the use of septic tanks and alternative waste disposal systems were not discussed. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. The facilities could also be located in areas with unstable soils or soils made up of highly plastic materials (e.g., sand or clay), such that they are unable to support septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil and soil incapable of supporting septic tanks or

alternative waste disposal system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

#### ***Primary Facility Category Impacts on a Programmatic Level***

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the last five years. On a programmatic level, impacts related to geology and soils as a result of constructing future new retail/service facilities may include potentially locating facilities in areas of known faults, such that people and structures are exposed to seismic effects, resulting in soil erosion or loss of top soil, exposing facilities to landslides and liquefaction, and locating project in areas with expansive soils, which could result in ground failure. Depending on the location of the individual facilities, the individual retail/services facilities may result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail/service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.7-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have related to geology and soils, including seismic effects, effects from soil erosion or loss of top soil, and effects of unstable and expansive soils. Based on a review of these documents, retail service facilities may occur along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by seismic activities, such as surface fault rupture, relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landslides. Individual projects may also be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant geology and soils impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to geology and soils identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, c) Expose people or structures to adverse seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence, etc.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact due to exposure of people and structures to geological effects. However, based on SCAQMD staff's

review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near or along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by surface fault rupture due to seismic activity. During an earthquake on these active or potentially active faults within the district, potential surface rupture of the fault may result in relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface. Individual retail/services facilities could be located in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides, unstable soil conditions causing subsidence, lateral spreading and liquefaction.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, and subsidence from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Soil erosion or loss of top soil.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to soil erosion or loss of top soil. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could result in soil erosion or loss of top soil due to wind and water erosion of areas with exposed soil and through surface run-off during irrigation and construction activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of top soil from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d, e) Expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste water disposal.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts due to expansive soils or soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste disposal systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features.

The facilities could also be located in areas with unstable soils or soils made up of highly plastic materials (e.g., sand or clay), such that they are unable to support septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil and soil incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, impacts related to geology and soils as a result of constructing future new large commercial facilities may include potentially locating facilities in areas of known faults, such that people and structures are exposed to seismic effects, resulting in soil erosion or loss of top soil, exposing facilities to landslides and liquefaction, and locating project in areas with expansive soils, which could result in ground failure. Depending on the location of the individual facilities, the individual large commercial facilities may result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.7-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have related to geology and soils, including seismic effects, effects from soil erosion or loss of top soil, and effects of unstable and expansive soils. Based on a review of these documents, retail service facilities may occur along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by seismic activities like surface fault rupture, relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landslides. Individual projects may also be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant geology and soils impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to geology and soils identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

- a, c) Expose people or structures to adverse seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence, etc.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to exposure of people and structures to geological effects. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near or along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by surface fault rupture due to seismic activity. During an earthquake on these active or potentially active faults within the district, potential surface rupture of the fault may result in relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface. Individual large commercial facilities could be located in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides, unstable soil conditions causing subsidence, lateral spreading and liquefaction

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, and subsidence from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Soil erosion or loss of top soil.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to soil erosion or loss of top soil. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could result in soil erosion or loss of top soil due to wind and water erosion of areas with exposed soil and through surface run-off during irrigation and construction activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of top soil from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d, e) Expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste water disposal.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to expansive soils and no impacts due to soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste disposal systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3

in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. The facilities could also be located in areas with unstable soils or soils made up of highly plastic materials (e.g., sand or clay), such that they are unable to support septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil and soil incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.7-1). Based on these historical data, some of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities are anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, impacts related to geology and soils as a result of constructing future new entertainment/recreational facilities may include potentially locating facilities in areas of known faults, such that people and structures are exposed to seismic effects, resulting in soil erosion or loss of top soil, exposing facilities to landslides and liquefaction, and locating project in areas with expansive soils, which could result in ground failure. Depending on the location of the individual facilities, the individual entertainment/recreational facilities may result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.7-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have related to geology and soils, including seismic effects, effects from soil erosion or loss of top soil, and effects of unstable and expansive soils. Based on a review of these documents, large entertainment/recreational facilities may occur along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by seismic activities like surface fault rupture, relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landslides. Individual projects may also be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil

settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. However, these projects were generally found to have less-than-significant geology and soils impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to geology and soils identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, c) Expose people or structures to adverse seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence, etc.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts due to the exposure of people and structures to geological effects were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). For one of the projects surveyed (Project #23- Wilmington Waterfront Development project), the CEQA document concluded that the entertainment/ recreational facility category project has the potential to have significant adverse impacts as the project site was located near a known fault line and had soils prone to liquefaction, thus, exposing people or structures to adverse seismic effects, such as liquefaction and strong ground shaking. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near or along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by surface fault rupture due to seismic activity. During an earthquake on these active or potentially active faults within the district, potential surface rupture of the fault may result in relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface. Individual entertainment/recreational facilities could be located in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides, unstable soil conditions causing subsidence, lateral spreading and liquefaction.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the additional considerations identified in the preceding paragraph, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, and subsidence from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Soil erosion or loss of top soil.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/ recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to soil erosion or loss of top soil. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could result in soil erosion or loss of top soil due to wind and water erosion of areas with exposed soil and through surface run-off during irrigation and construction activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of top soil from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**d, e) Expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste water disposal.** Four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts due to expansive soils or soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste disposal systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. The facilities could also be located in areas with unstable soils or soils made up of highly plastic materials (e.g., sand or clay), such that they are unable to support septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil and soil incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, impacts related to geology and soils as a result of constructing future new institutional facilities may include potentially locating facilities in areas of known faults, such that people and structures are exposed to seismic effects, resulting in soil erosion or loss of top soil, exposing facilities to landslides and liquefaction, and locating project in areas with expansive soils, which could result in ground failure. Depending on the location of the individual facilities, the individual institutional facilities may result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.7-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have related to geology and soils, including seismic effects, effects from soil erosion or loss of top soil, and effects of unstable and expansive soils. Based on a review of these documents, institutional facilities may occur along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by seismic activities like surface fault rupture, relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landslides. Individual projects may also be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant geology and soils impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to geology and soils identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, c) Expose people or structures to adverse seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence, etc.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact due to exposure of people and structures to geological effects. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near or along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by surface fault rupture due to seismic activity. During an earthquake on these active or potentially active faults within the district, potential surface rupture of the fault may result in relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface. Individual institutional facilities could be located in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides, unstable soil conditions causing subsidence, lateral spreading and liquefaction.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, and subsidence from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Soil erosion or loss of top soil.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to soil erosion or loss of top soil. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts

in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could result in soil erosion or loss of top soil due to wind and water erosion of areas with exposed soil and through surface run-off during irrigation and construction activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of top soil from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**d, e) Expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste water disposal.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts due to expansive soils or soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste disposal systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. The facilities could also be located in areas with unstable soils or soils made up of highly plastic materials (e.g., sand or clay), such that they are unable to support septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil and soil incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, impacts related to geology and soils as a result of constructing future new transportation facilities may include potentially locating facilities in areas of known faults, such that people and structures are exposed to seismic effects, resulting in soil erosion or loss of top soil, exposing facilities to landslides and liquefaction, and locating project in areas with expansive soils, which could result in ground failure. Depending on the location of the individual facilities, the individual transportation facilities may result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.7-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have related to geology and soils, including seismic effects, effects from soil erosion or loss of top soil, and effects of unstable and expansive soils. Based on a review of these documents, transportation facilities may occur along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by seismic activities like surface fault rupture, relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landslides. Individual projects may also be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to geology and soils identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, c) Expose people or structures to adverse seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence, etc.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts due to the exposure of people and structures to geological effects were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However for one of the projects surveyed (Project #39- TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147), the lead agency concluded that the transportation-related project has the potential to have significant adverse impacts as the project site was located near a known fault line and had soils prone to liquefaction, thus, exposing people or structures to adverse seismic effects like liquefaction, strong ground shaking, tsunami, seiche, etc. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near or along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by surface fault rupture due to seismic activity. During an earthquake on these active or potentially active faults within the district, potential surface rupture of the fault may result in relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface. Individual transportation facilities could be located in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides, unstable soil conditions causing subsidence, lateral spreading and liquefaction.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, and subsidence from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Soil erosion or loss of top soil.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to soil erosion or loss of top soil. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could result in soil erosion or loss of top soil due to wind and water erosion of areas with exposed soil and through surface run-off during irrigation and construction activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of top soil from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d, e) Expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste water disposal.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts due to expansive soils and either no impact or less-than-significant impacts due to soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste disposal systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. The facilities could also be located in areas with unstable soils or soils made up of highly plastic materials (e.g., sand or clay), such that they are unable to support septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil and soil incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. On a programmatic level, impacts related to geology and soils as a result of constructing future new utility facilities may include potentially locating facilities in areas of known faults, such that people and structures are exposed to seismic effects, resulting in soil erosion or loss of top soil, exposing facilities to landslides and liquefaction, and locating project in areas with expansive soils, which could result in ground failure. Depending on the location of the individual facilities, the individual utility facilities may result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.7-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have related to geology and soils, including seismic effects, effects from soil erosion or loss of top soil, and effects of unstable and expansive soils. Based on a review of these documents, utility projects may occur along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by seismic activities like surface fault rupture, relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landslides. Individual projects may also be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant geology and soils impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to geology and soils identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, c) Expose people or structures to adverse seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence, etc.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to exposure of people and structures to geological effects. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that

future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near or along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by surface fault rupture due to seismic activity. During an earthquake on these active or potentially active faults within the district, potential surface rupture of the fault may result in relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface. Individual utility facilities could be located in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides, unstable soil conditions causing subsidence, lateral spreading and liquefaction

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence and from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Soil erosion or loss of top soil.** The CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to soil erosion or loss of top soil. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could result in soil erosion or loss of top soil due to wind and water erosion of areas with exposed soil and through surface run-off during irrigation and construction activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of top soil from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d, e) Expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste water disposal.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact due to expansive soils and no impacts due to soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste disposal systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. The facilities could also be located in areas with unstable soils or soils made up of highly plastic materials (e.g., sand or clay), such that they are unable to support septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil and soil incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, impacts related to geology and soils as a result of constructing future new light industrial/warehouse facilities may include potentially locating facilities in areas of known faults, such that people and structures are exposed to seismic effects, resulting in soil erosion or loss of top soil, exposing facilities to landslides and liquefaction, and locating project in areas with expansive soils, which could result in ground failure. Depending on the location of the individual facilities, the individual light industrial/warehouse facilities may result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.7-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have related to geology and soils, including seismic effects, effects from soil erosion or loss of top soil, and effects of unstable and expansive soils. Based on a review of these documents, light industrial/warehouse facilities may occur along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by seismic activities like surface fault rupture, relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landslides. Individual projects may also be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant geology and soils impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to geology and soils identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, c) Expose people or structures to adverse seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence, etc.** The four CEQA documents

for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to exposure of people and structures to geological effects. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near or along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by surface fault rupture due to seismic activity. During an earthquake on these active or potentially active faults within the district, potential surface rupture of the fault may result in relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface. Individual light industrial/warehouse facilities could be located in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides, unstable soil conditions causing subsidence, lateral spreading, and liquefaction.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, and subsidence from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Soil erosion or loss of top soil.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) due to soil erosion or loss of top soil. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could result in soil erosion or loss of top soil due to wind and water erosion of areas with exposed soil and through surface run-off during irrigation and construction activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of top soil from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d, e) Expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste water disposal.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact due to expansive soils and no impacts due to soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste disposal systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future

individual projects in this facility category could be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. The facilities could also be located in areas with unstable soils or soils made up of highly plastic materials (e.g., sand or clay), such that they are unable to support septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil and soil incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, impacts related to geology and soils as a result of constructing future new heavy industrial facilities may include potentially locating facilities in areas of known faults, such that people and structures are exposed to seismic effects, resulting in soil erosion or loss of top soil, exposing facilities to landslides and liquefaction, and locating project in areas with expansive soils, which could result in ground failure. Depending on the location of the individual facilities, the individual heavy industrial facilities may result in significant adverse impacts related to geology and soils.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.7-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have related to geology and soils, including seismic effects, effects from soil erosion or loss of top soil, and effects of unstable and expansive soils. Based on a review of these documents, heavy industrial facilities may occur along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by seismic activities like surface fault rupture, relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landslides. Individual projects may also be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant geology and soils impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an

overall summary of the types of impacts related to geology and soils identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, c) Expose people or structures to adverse seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, subsidence, etc.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts due to exposure of people and structures to geological effects. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited near or along active faults and would be subject to hazards posed by surface fault rupture due to seismic activity. During an earthquake on these active or potentially active faults within the district, potential surface rupture of the fault may result in relative displacement of the ground across the fault surface. Individual heavy industrial facilities could be located in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides, unstable soil conditions causing subsidence, lateral spreading, and liquefaction.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to seismic effects, unstable soil conditions, landslides, liquefactions, and subsidence from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Soil erosion or loss of top soil.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impact or less-than-significant impacts due to soil erosion or loss of top soil. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could result in soil erosion or loss of top soil due to wind and water erosion of areas with exposed soil and through surface run-off during irrigation and construction activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of top soil from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**d, e) Expansive soils and soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative waste water disposal.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts due to expansive soils or soils incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative

waste disposal systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be subject to impacts resulting from subsidence, soil settlement, and expansive and corrosive soils, all of which have the potential to cause damage to building foundations, structures, pavements, and other landscape features. The facilities could also be located in areas with unstable soils or soils made up of highly plastic materials (e.g., sand or clay), such that they are unable to support septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to geology and soils could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil and soil incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative waste disposal system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to geology and soils that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the previous CEQA documents found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts related to the exposure of people and structures to adverse seismic conditions or conditions related to unstable soils generated by landslides, liquefaction, subsidence, etc. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents surveyed for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to geology and soils as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects" [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal credit accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);

- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez) proposed SB 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill, which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal credit accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. The construction and operation of past development projects have resulted in some impacts related to geology and soils by exposing people and structures to seismic and other geologic hazards or disturbance of unique geological features. While most projects typically conform to uniform building codes and other geotechnical construction/operation standards, the impacts related to geology and soils remain dependent on project location. Further, the entire district is susceptible to impacts from seismic activity. Thus, any future development within the district resulting from the project would cumulatively contribute to the exposure of people and structure to geologic risks. Since the specific location and type of future unknown facilities cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative geology and soils impacts is even more uncertain. However, some of the past projects were determined to have significant adverse impacts related to geology and spoils, including impacts related to seismic activities.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The FSAs prepared for all three power plant projects concluded that geology and soils impacts could be mitigated to less than significant. For example, the CEC determined that no known geological resources will be impacted by the construction and operation of the El Segundo project because there is to be little new grading and there is a minimal probability that significant paleontological resources will be encountered during the retooling of the power plant. According the FSA for the El Segundo project, the following mitigation measures will ensure the geological impacts will be less than significant: assign an engineering geologist and a geotechnical engineer to the project; conduct a liquefaction analysis and a slope stability analysis; conduct a shoreline monitoring program and assess erosion on the beach area; prepare an engineering geology report; design an additional seawall or perimeter wall; provide maps and

drawings showing the footprint of the power plant and all linear facilities to the paleontological resource specialist (PRS) and the compliance project manager (CPM) for approval; prepare a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (PRMMP); prepare and conduct weekly CPM-approved training; monitor all construction-related grading, excavation, trenching, and augering; ensure the recovery, preparation for analysis, analysis, identification and inventory, the preparation for curation, and the delivery for curation of all significant paleontological resource materials; and prepare a Paleontological Resources Report (PRR).

The FSA for the Walnut Creek project states that with the exception of strong ground shaking and possible liquefaction potential during an earthquake, the Walnut Creek project site lies in an area that generally exhibits low geologic hazards. The effects of strong ground shaking and, possibly, liquefaction potential must be mitigated through structural design as required by the California Building Code. According to the CEC, paleontological resources have been documented in the general area of the project; however, no significant fossils were identified during initial site investigations due to the urbanized character of the area. The CEC concluded there is a possibility of encountering fossil remains with potentially high paleontologic sensitivity in Pleistocene sediments that are present at unknown depth below low sensitivity middle-Holocene sediments and fill materials, however, the potential impacts to paleontological resources due to construction activities would be mitigated to less than significant. Such mitigation listed in the FSA include: assigning an approved PRS to the project; providing maps and drawings showing the footprint of the power plant and all linear facilities to the PRS; prepare a PRMMP; prepare and conduct weekly CPM-approved training for all workers; monitor all construction-related grading, excavation, trenching, and augering; ensure the recovery, preparation for analysis, analysis, identification and inventory, the preparation for curation, and the delivery for curation of all significant paleontological resource materials; and prepare a Paleontological Resources Report (PRR).

According to the FSA prepared by the CEC for the Sentinel project, the site would be located in an active geologic area southeast of the San Bernardino Mountains in Southern California, and because of its geologic setting, the site could be subject to intense levels of earthquake related ground shaking. The CEC determined that while the potential for earthquake ground rupture is low, the site is 0.25 miles from the San Andreas (Banning) Fault and there are many other major active faults within 20 miles of the site. It was concluded in the FSA that the effects of strong ground shaking must be mitigated, to the extent practical, through structural designs required by the California Building Code, which requires that structures be designed to resist seismic stresses from ground acceleration and, to a lesser extent, liquefaction potential. The CEC proposed standard engineering design recommendations to mitigate the effects of strong ground shaking and dynamic compaction. In addition, the applicant has indicated that the potential effects of expansive clay soils, as well as excessive settlement due to compressible soils and hydro-compaction, will be addressed in an addendum to the project geotechnical report to be submitted prior to site grading. The CEC determined that there are no known viable geologic or mineralogical resources at the site; paleontological resources have been documented within six miles of the project; no significant fossils were found during cursory field evaluation of the plant site, near ancillary facilities or at the off-site lay

down area; and potential impacts to paleontological resources due to construction activities would be mitigated through worker training and monitoring by qualified paleontologists. Specific mitigation to reduce geology impacts to less than significant are listed as the following in the FSA: assigning an approved PRS to the project; providing maps and drawings showing the footprint of the power plant and all linear facilities to the PRS; preparing a PRMMP; preparing and conducting weekly CPM-approved training; monitoring all construction-related grading, excavation, trenching, and augering; ensuring the recovery, preparation for analysis, analysis, identification and inventory, the preparation for curation, and the delivery for curation of all significant paleontological resource materials; and preparing a Paleontological Resources Report (PRR).

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)), and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative impacts to geology and soils.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Geology and Soils Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant geology and soils impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts that are outside of its jurisdictional authority is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse geology and soils impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for geology and soils impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of geology and soils impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant geology and soils impact, the potential exists for future indirect geology and soils impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.8**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES – HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Additionally, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse indirect impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, depending on the nature of the project and its use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential impacts on hazards and hazardous materials from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed projects in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials include the emission or creation of hazards and hazardous materials involving upset or accident that may be caused by future new projects. Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- Create hazard through transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.
- Create hazard through upset or accident involving the release of hazardous materials.
- Emit hazardous emissions within one quarter mile of a school.
- Located on a known hazardous materials site.
- Located within an airport land use plan or within vicinity of private airstrip.

- Impair implementation of physically interfere with adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- Expose people or structures to risk of loss involving wildland fires.
- Increase fire hazards in area with flammable materials.
- Non-compliance with any applicable design code or regulation.
- Non-conformance to National Fire Protection Association standards.
- Non-conformance to regulations or generally accepted industry practices related to operating policy and procedures concerning the design, construction, security, leak detection, spill containment or fire protection.
- Exposure to hazardous chemicals in concentrations equal to or greater than the Emergency Response Planning Guideline (ERPG) 2 levels.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Based on the methodology described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. While the specific nature or degree of impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit

existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that many more new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts due to hazards and hazardous materials as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include the creation of hazards through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school. Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to sensitive uses, such as schools. Agricultural activities typically involve the use or transport of fertilizers and/or other chemicals and may result in significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.8-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials that could occur. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities that involve the transport or use of chemicals and fertilizers could result in impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a) Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location (e.g., schools, residential areas, etc.) that could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents were reviewed since they illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.8-1  
Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       |  | N – No impacts  |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination   |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
|  | a) Create hazard through transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials | b) Create hazard through upset or accident involving release of hazardous materials | c) Emit hazard within ¼ mile of school | d) Located on known hazardous materials site? | e) Located within Airport Land Use Plan | f) Located within vicinity of private airstrip | g) Impair implementation of evacuation plan | h) Expose persons, structures to wildland fires | i) Increase fire hazards in area with flammable materials? |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>                                   |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR                                    | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | NE  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | LSM   | LSM  |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                               | LS   | LS  | NE                                     | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | LS   |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                        | LS   | N   | LS                                     | N   | N                                       | N  | N   | N   | NE   |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR                                  | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LSM   | NE                                      | NE   | LS  | NE  | NE   |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                   | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                    | LS  | LS                                      | LS   | LS  | N   | NE   |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                               | LSM  | LSM   | N                                      | LSM   | N                                       | N  | N   | N   | NE   |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                    | LS   | LSM   | LS                                     | LSM   | N                                       | N  | LS  | N   | NE   |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                | N  | N   | N                                      | N   | N                                       | N  | N   | N   | N  |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                        | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LSM   | NE                                      | NE   | LSM   | NE  | NE   |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | LSM  | LS  | NE                                     | LS  | NE                                      | LS   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                               |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel, Travelodge Hotel EIR                    | LS   | LSM   | LSM                                    | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | LS  | NE  | NE   |

**TABLE 5.8-1 (Continued)**  
**Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       |  | N – No impacts  |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination   |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
|  | a) Create hazard through transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials | b) Create hazard through upset or accident involving release of hazardous materials | c) Emit hazard within ¼ mile of school | d) Located on known hazardous materials site? | e) Located within Airport Land Use Plan | f) Located within vicinity of private airstrip | g) Impair implementation of evacuation plan | h) Expose persons, structures to wildland fires | i) Increase fire hazards in area with flammable materials? |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR                                     | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR                                 | N  | N   | N                                      | N   | N                                       | N  | N   | N   | N  |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                 | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | NE  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR                                  | LSM  | LSM   | N                                      | N   | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR                                  | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | NE  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                            | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | NE  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                | LS   | LSM   | LS                                     | LS  | LS                                      | LS   | LS  | LS  | NE   |
| Entertainment/Recreational Facilities                            |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR           | LS   | LS  | N                                      | LSM   | N                                       | N  | LSM   | N   | N  |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR               | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LSM   | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR                                     | LS   | LS  | LS                                     | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                | LS   | LS  | NE                                     | NE  | NE                                      | NE   | LS  | NE  | NE   |

**TABLE 5.8-1 (Continued)**  
**Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       |  | N – No impacts  |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination   |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
|  | a) Create hazard through transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials | b) Create hazard through upset or accident involving release of hazardous materials | c) Emit hazard within ¼ mile of school | d) Located on known hazardous materials site? | e) Located within Airport Land Use Plan | f) Located within vicinity of private airstrip | g) Impair implementation of evacuation plan | h) Expose persons, structures to wildland fires | i) Increase fire hazards in area with flammable materials? |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>                                  |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR                         | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LSM   | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                       | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | LS  | NE  | NE   |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supp. EIR                            | NE   | NE  | NE                                     | NE  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | N   | NE   |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                    | LS   | LS  | LS                                     | LS  | LS                                      | LS   | LS  | LS  | NE   |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR                              | N  | LSM   | LS                                     | N   | N                                       | N  | LS  | N   | NE   |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR                              | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | NE  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR                         | LS   | LS  | LS                                     | LS  | LS                                      | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS   |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle Sch. Reloc. EIR                          | LS   | LS  | LS                                     | LS  | LS                                      | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS   |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR                               | LSM  | LSM   | LS                                     | LS  | N                                       | N  | LS  | N   | NE   |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR                               | LS   | LS  | LS                                     | LS  | N                                       | N  | LS  | N   | N  |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR            | LS   | LS  | LS                                     | LS  | LS                                      | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS   |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                    | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.                    | LS   | LS  | LS                                     | N   | N                                       | N  | N   | N   | N  |

**TABLE 5.8-1 (Continued)**  
**Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   |  | N – No impacts  |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination   |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
|  | a) Create hazard through transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials | b) Create hazard through upset or accident involving release of hazardous materials | c) Emit hazard within ¼ mile of school | d) Located on known hazardous materials site? | e) Located within Airport Land Use Plan | f) Located within vicinity of private airstrip | g) Impair implementation of evacuation plan | h) Expose persons, structures to wildland fires | i) Increase fire hazards in area with flammable materials? |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LS  | LS                                      | NE   | LS  | NE  | NE   |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | LS   | LS  | LS                                     | LS  | LS                                      | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS   |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | LS   | LS  | LS                                     | LS  | LS                                      | LS   | LSM   | LS  | LS   |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| <b>Utility Projects (Includes Power Plants)</b>  |  |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | LSM  | LSM   | NE                                     | NE  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | S  | S   | NE                                     | NE  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE   |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR  | LS   | LS  | NE                                     | LS  | NE                                      | NE   | NE  | NE  | LS   |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR                      | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                                    | LS  | N                                       | N  | LSM   | LS  | LS   |

**TABLE 5.8-1 (Concluded)**  
**Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |   |  |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| S – Significant   |   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>  |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |   | N – No impacts   |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |   |  |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>   | <b>Significance Determination</b>   |  |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |
|   | <b>a) Create hazard through transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials</b> | <b>b) Create hazard through upset or accident involving release of hazardous materials</b> | <b>c) Emit hazard within ¼ mile of school</b> | <b>d) Located on known hazardous materials site?</b> | <b>e) Located within Airport Land Use Plan</b> | <b>f) Located within vicinity of private airstrip</b> | <b>g) Impair implementation of evacuation plan</b> | <b>h) Expose persons, structures to wildland fires</b> | <b>i) Increase fire hazards in area with flammable materials?</b> |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>  |   |  |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LSM   | LS   | LS   | LS  |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | LSM   | LSM  | LS  | LSM  | N  | N   | N  | N  | N   |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | LSM   | LSM  | LS  | LS   | N  | N   | LS   | N  | NE  |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |   |  |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | LS  | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LS  | LSM  | N   | LS   | N  | LS  | LS   | LS   | NE  |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | LS  | LS   | N   | LS   | N  | N   | N  | N  | LS  |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |   |  |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |

- b) Upset or Accident Involving Release of Hazardous Materials.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create upset conditions or accidental release of hazardous materials that could significantly impact adjacent land uses, including schools and residential areas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Emit Hazard Within ¼ Mile of Schools.** The two CEQA documents for proposed projects in the agricultural facility category did not address impacts related to the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within a quarter mile of a school that could create significant adverse impacts resulting from potential hazardous emissions that may affect the health and safety of the school occupants.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of schools as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Located on Known Hazardous Materials Site.** One of the two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact regarding the project's location on a known hazardous materials site; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be located on a known hazardous materials site that could create significant adverse impacts related to exposure to potential hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts associated with a project’s potential location on a known hazardous materials site as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Located Within Airport Land Use Plan or Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip.** Neither of the two CEQA documents proposed projects in the agricultural facility category addressed impacts related to the project sites’ location within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within an airport land use plan or near a private airstrip, which could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards associated with aviation activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related hazards associated with aviation activities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Impair implementation of Evacuation Plan.** Neither of the two CEQA documents for the proposed projects in the agricultural facility category addressed impacts associated with the implementation of an evacuation plan. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could impair or interfere with the implementation of an evacuation plan for a particularly area and potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts to a particular area’s evacuation plan resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- h) Exposure to Wildland Fires.** One of the two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation related to wildland fires; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to wildland fires. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s

review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near high fire hazard areas, including, but not limited to, mountain and wildland areas, which could potentially result in significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fires resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- i) Increase Fire Hazards in Areas with Flammable Materials.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the potential increase of fire hazards in areas with flammable materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is considered a high fire hazard area due to the use or manufacture of flammable materials, which could potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to fire hazards associated with the use or manufacture of flammable materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the last five years. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential for resulting in significant impacts related to hazards and

hazardous materials. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.8-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials that retail/services facilities would have, including impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; emissions of hazardous materials; and safety risks associated with hazardous materials sites, aviation activities, wildland fires, and flammable materials. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings. However, project-specific impacts were generally considered less-than-significant. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Transport, Use or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location (e.g., schools, residential areas, etc.) that could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Upset or Accident Involving Release of Hazardous Materials.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create upset conditions or accidental

release of hazardous materials that could significantly impact adjacent land uses, including schools and residential areas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Emit Hazard Within ¼ Mile of Schools.** Five of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within a quarter mile of a school that could create significant adverse impacts resulting from potential hazardous emissions that may affect the health and safety of the school occupants.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of schools as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Located on Known Hazardous Materials Site.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts regarding the projects’ location on known hazardous materials sites. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be located on a known hazardous materials site that could create significant adverse impacts related to exposure to potential hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts associated with a project’s potential location on a known hazardous materials site as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Located Within Airport Land Use Plan or Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip.** Six of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to the project sites' location within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within an airport land use plan or near a private airstrip, which could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards associated with aviation activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, aviation impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related hazards associated with aviation activities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Impair implementation of Evacuation Plan.** Seven of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts associated with the implementation of an evacuation plan; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could impair or interfere with the implementation of an evacuation plan for a particularly area and potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts to a particular area's evacuation plan resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- h) Exposure to Wildland Fires.** Five of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed no impacts related to wildland fires; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to wildland fires. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near high fire hazard areas, including, but not limited to, mountain and wildland areas, which could potentially result in significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fires resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- i) **Increase Fire Hazards in Areas with Flammable Materials.** One of the eight CEQA documents for a past project in the retail/services facility category disclosed no impact related to the potential increase of fire hazards in areas with flammable materials; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is considered a high fire hazard area due to the use or manufacture of flammable materials, which could potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to fire hazards associated with the use or manufacture of flammable materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas. These facilities have a low potential for resulting in significant impacts related to the transport or use of hazardous materials. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.8-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional

shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials that could occur, including impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; emissions of hazardous materials; and safety risks associated with hazardous materials sites, aviation activities, wildland fires, and flammable materials. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas. Project-specific impacts were generally considered less-than-significant. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location (e.g., schools, residential areas, etc.) that could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Upset or Accident Involving Release of Hazardous Materials.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impact related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create upset conditions or accidental release of hazardous materials that could significantly impact adjacent land uses, including schools and residential areas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Emit Hazard Within ¼ Mile of Schools.** Four of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school; the other five CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within a quarter mile of a school that could create significant adverse impacts resulting from potential hazardous emissions that may affect the health and safety of the school occupants.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of schools as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Located on Known Hazardous Materials Site.** Six of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts regarding the projects' location on known hazardous materials sites; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be located on a known hazardous materials site that could create significant adverse impacts related to exposure to potential hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts associated with a project's potential location on a known hazardous materials site as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Located Within Airport Land Use Plan or Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip.** Two the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impact related to the project sites' location within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within an airport land

use plan or near a private airstrip, which could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards associated with aviation activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, aviation impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related hazards associated with aviation activities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Impair implementation of Evacuation Plan.** Three of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact associated with the implementation of an evacuation plan; the other six CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could impair or interfere with the implementation of an evacuation plan for a particularly area and potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts to a particular area’s evacuation plan resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- h) Exposure to Wildland Fires.** Two of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impact related to wildland fires; the other seven CEQA documents did not address impacts related to wildland fires. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near high fire hazard areas, including, but not limited to, mountain and wildland areas, which could potentially result in significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fires resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- i) Increase Fire Hazards in Areas with Flammable Materials.** One of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed no impact related to the potential increase of fire hazards in areas with flammable materials; the other eight CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is considered a high fire hazard area due to the use or manufacture of flammable materials, which could potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to fire hazards associated with the use or manufacture of flammable materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, some of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities are anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to result in impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, including the use or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.8-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on hazards and hazardous materials, including impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; emissions of hazardous materials; and safety risks associated with hazardous materials sites, aviation activities, wildland fires, and flammable materials. These projects involved a variety of different structures,

including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, outdoor lighting, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which could involve the use and transport of various hazardous materials such as chemicals, fertilizers etc. Accordingly, these projects could have significant adverse impacts. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location (e.g., schools, residential areas, etc.) that could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Upset or Accident Involving Release of Hazardous Materials.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create upset conditions or accidental release of hazardous materials that could significantly impact adjacent land uses, including schools and residential areas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Emit Hazard Within ¼ Mile of Schools.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impact related to the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts

related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within a quarter mile of a school that could create significant adverse impacts resulting from potential hazardous emissions that may affect the health and safety of the school occupants.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of schools as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Located on Known Hazardous Materials Site.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) regarding the projects' location on known hazardous materials sites; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be located on a known hazardous materials site that could create significant adverse impacts related to exposure to potential hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts associated with a project's potential location on a known hazardous materials site as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Located Within Airport Land Use Plan or Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip.** One of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed no impact related to the project sites' location within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within an airport land use plan or near a private airstrip, which could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards associated with aviation activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared and in different environmental settings, hazards and

hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related hazards associated with aviation activities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Impair implementation of Evacuation Plan.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) associated with the implementation of an evacuation plan; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could impair or interfere with the implementation of an evacuation plan for a particularly area and potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts to a particular area's evacuation plan resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- h) Exposure to Wildland Fires.** One of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed no impact related to wildland fires; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to wildland fires. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near high fire hazard areas, including, but not limited to, mountain and wildland areas, which could potentially result in significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fires resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- i) Increase Fire Hazards in Areas with Flammable Materials.** One of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed no impact related to the potential increase of fire hazards in areas with flammable materials; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a

location that is considered a high fire hazard area due to the use or manufacture of flammable materials, which could potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to fire hazards associated with the use or manufacture of flammable materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas. These future facilities could result in significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. The potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.8-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on hazards and hazardous materials, including impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; emissions of hazardous materials; and safety risks associated with hazardous materials sites, aviation activities, wildland fires, and flammable materials. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities. However, these projects were generally found to have less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** Fourteen of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location (e.g., schools, residential areas, etc.) that could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Upset or Accident Involving Release of Hazardous Materials.** Fourteen of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create upset conditions or accidental release of hazardous materials that could significantly impact adjacent land uses, including schools and residential areas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Emit Hazard Within ¼ Mile of Schools.** Nine of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school; the other six CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within a quarter mile of a school that could create significant adverse impacts resulting from potential hazardous emissions that may affect the health and safety of the school occupants.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of schools as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Located on Known Hazardous Materials Site.** Thirteen of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact regarding the projects’ location on known hazardous materials sites; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be located on a known hazardous materials site that could create significant adverse impacts related to exposure to potential hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts associated with a project’s potential location on a known hazardous materials site as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Located Within Airport Land Use Plan or Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip.** Nine of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to the project sites’ location within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip; the other six CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within an airport land use plan or near a private airstrip, which could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards associated with aviation activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related hazards associated with aviation activities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Impair implementation of Evacuation Plan.** Ten of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-

significant impacts or no impact associated with the implementation of an evacuation plan; the other five CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could impair or interfere with the implementation of an evacuation plan for a particularly area and potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts to a particular area's evacuation plan resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- h) Exposure to Wildland Fires.** Nine of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to wildland fires; the other six CEQA documents did not address impacts related to wildland fires. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near high fire hazard areas, including, but not limited to, mountain and wildland areas, which could potentially result in significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fires resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- i) Increase Fire Hazards in Areas with Flammable Materials.** Five of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to the potential increase of fire hazards in areas with flammable materials; the other 10 CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is considered a high fire hazard area due to the use or manufacture of flammable materials, which could potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time

the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to fire hazards associated with the use or manufacture of flammable materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting. The potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.8-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on hazards and hazardous materials, including impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; emissions of hazardous materials; and safety risks associated with hazardous materials sites, aviation activities, wildland fires, and flammable materials. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, bus storage and maintenance facilities, and mixed-use residential and commercial facilities. However, the CEQA documents for the projects that were surveyed were found to have less-than-significant impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the transport, use, or disposal of

hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location (e.g., schools, residential areas, etc.) that could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Upset or Accident Involving Release of Hazardous Materials.** Three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create upset conditions or accidental release of hazardous materials that could significantly impact adjacent land uses, including schools and residential areas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Emit Hazard Within ¼ Mile of Schools.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within a quarter mile of a school that could create significant adverse impacts resulting from potential hazardous emissions that may affect the health and safety of the school occupants.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant.

Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of schools as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Located on Known Hazardous Materials Site.** Three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation category disclosed less-than-significant impacts regarding the projects' location on known hazardous materials sites. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be located on a known hazardous materials site that could create significant adverse impacts related to exposure to potential hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts associated with a project's potential location on a known hazardous materials site as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Located Within Airport Land Use Plan or Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the project sites' location within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within an airport land use plan or near a private airstrip, which could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards associated with aviation activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related hazards associated with aviation activities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Impair implementation of Evacuation Plan.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) associated with the implementation of an evacuation plan; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that

future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could impair or interfere with the implementation of an evacuation plan for a particularly area and potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts to a particular area’s evacuation plan resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- h) Exposure to Wildland Fires.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to wildland fires; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to wildland fires. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near high fire hazard areas, including, but not limited to, mountain and wildland areas, which could potentially result in significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fires resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- i) Increase Fire Hazards in Areas with Flammable Materials.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the potential increase of fire hazards in areas with flammable materials; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is considered a high fire hazard area due to the use or manufacture of flammable materials, which could potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to fire hazards associated with the use or manufacture of flammable materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity and the distributed nature of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Impacts from the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials could occur at these facilities. Therefore, future construction and operation of utility facilities could likely generate significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.8-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that could occur, including impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; emissions of hazardous materials; and safety risks associated with hazardous materials sites, aviation activities, wildland fires, and flammable materials. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, could result in impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Transport, Use or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** For most of the projects in the utility facility category, environmental impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials were less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). For one of the projects surveyed (Project #43 – LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications), the CEQA document concluded that this project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Currently, hazardous materials are transported throughout the district’s jurisdiction in great quantities via all modes of transportation including rail, highway, water, air and pipeline.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA

documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, and the additional consideration identified above, impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Upset or Accident Involving Release of Hazardous Materials.** For most of the projects in the utility facility category, environmental impacts related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials were less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #43 – LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications), the CEQA document concluded that this project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials. More specifically, releases of hazardous materials, including aqueous ammonia, have the potential for harmful effects on workers and the public. Causes of these releases may include plant upsets; leaks in seals; pipeline failures; vehicular traffic accidents; and failures during ammonia delivery, such as hose leaks.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts due to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Emit Hazard Within ¼ Mile of Schools.** One of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures related to the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within a quarter mile of a school that could create significant adverse impacts resulting from potential hazardous emissions that may affect the health and safety of the school occupants.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of schools as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Located on Known Hazardous Materials Site.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts regarding the projects’ location on known hazardous materials sites; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this

facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be located on a known hazardous materials site that could create significant adverse impacts related to exposure to potential hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts associated with a project's potential location on a known hazardous materials site as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Located Within Airport Land Use Plan or Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip.** One of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed no impact related to the project site's location within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within an airport land use plan or near a private airstrip, which could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards associated with aviation activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related hazards associated with aviation activities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Impair implementation of Evacuation Plan.** One of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures associated with the implementation of an evacuation plan; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could impair or interfere with the implementation of an evacuation plan for a particularly area and potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different

environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts to a particular area's evacuation plan resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- h) Exposure to Wildland Fires.** One of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact related to wildland fires; the other three CEQA documents did not address impacts related to wildland fires. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near high fire hazard areas, including, but not limited to, mountain and wildland areas, which could potentially result in significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fires resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- i) Increase Fire Hazards in Areas with Flammable Materials.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the potential increase of fire hazards in areas with flammable materials; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is considered a high fire hazard area due to the use or manufacture of flammable materials, which could potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to fire hazards associated with the use or manufacture of flammable materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

#### ***Primary Facility Category Impacts on a Programmatic Level***

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new

construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings that may result in significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.8-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on hazards and hazardous materials, including impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; emissions of hazardous materials; and safety risks associated with hazardous materials sites, aviation activities, wildland fires, and flammable materials. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the light industrial uses may involve the use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials and may result in impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. However, adverse effects were found to be less-than-significant. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location (e.g., schools, residential areas, etc.) that could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Upset or Accident Involving Release of Hazardous Materials.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category

that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create upset conditions or accidental release of hazardous materials that could significantly impact adjacent land uses, including schools and residential areas.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Emit Hazard Within ¼ Mile of Schools.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within a quarter mile of a school that could create significant adverse impacts resulting from potential hazardous emissions that may affect the health and safety of the school occupants.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of schools as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Located on Known Hazardous Materials Site.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) regarding the projects' location on known hazardous materials sites. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be located on a known hazardous materials site that could create significant adverse impacts related to exposure to potential hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts associated with a project's potential location on a known hazardous materials site as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Located Within Airport Land Use Plan or Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to the project site's location within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within an airport land use plan or near a private airstrip, which could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards associated with aviation activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related hazards associated with aviation activities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Impair implementation of Evacuation Plan.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact associated with the implementation of an evacuation plan. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could impair or interfere with the implementation of an evacuation plan for a particularly area and potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts to a particular area's evacuation plan resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- h) Exposure to Wildland Fires.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to wildland fires. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near high fire hazard areas, including, but not limited to, mountain and wildland areas, which could potentially result in significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fires resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- i) **Increase Fire Hazards in Areas with Flammable Materials.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to the potential increase of fire hazards in areas with flammable materials; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is considered a high fire hazard area due to the use or manufacture of flammable materials, which could potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to fire hazards associated with the use or manufacture of flammable materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. These types of project could significantly impact hazards and hazardous materials through transporting or disposing of hazardous materials. Therefore, these future heavy industrial facilities have the potential of generating significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.8-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing

refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials that could occur, including impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; emissions of hazardous materials; and safety risks associated with hazardous materials sites, aviation activities, wildland fires, and flammable materials. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could result in impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location (e.g., schools, residential areas, etc.) that could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Upset or Accident Involving Release of Hazardous Materials.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create upset conditions or accidental release of hazardous materials that could significantly impact adjacent land uses, including schools and residential areas

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts due to the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Emit Hazard Within ¼ Mile of Schools.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts related to the emission of hazards within a quarter mile of a school. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within a quarter mile of a school that could create significant adverse impacts resulting from potential hazardous emissions that may affect the health and safety of the school occupants.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions within a quarter mile of schools as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Located on Known Hazardous Materials Site.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial category disclosed less-than-significant impacts regarding the projects' location on known hazardous materials sites. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be located on a known hazardous materials site that could create significant adverse impacts related to exposure to potential hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts associated with a project's potential location on a known hazardous materials site as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Located Within Airport Land Use Plan or Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to the project site's location within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited within an airport land use plan or near a private airstrip, which could create significant adverse impacts related to hazards associated with aviation activities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related hazards associated with aviation activities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Impair implementation of Evacuation Plan.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact associated with the implementation of an evacuation plan. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could impair or interfere with the implementation of an evacuation plan for a particularly area and potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts to a particular area’s evacuation plan resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- h) Exposure to Wildland Fires.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to wildland fires. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near high fire hazard areas, including, but not limited to, mountain and wildland areas, which could potentially result in significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fires resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- i) Increase Fire Hazards in Areas with Flammable Materials.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the potential increase of fire hazards in areas with flammable materials; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is considered a high fire hazard area due to the use or manufacture of flammable materials, which could potentially create significant adverse safety impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, hazards and hazardous materials impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to fire hazards associated with the use or manufacture of flammable materials resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documents found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, specifically impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and the accidental release of hazardous materials. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects." [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal credit accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez) and proposed SB 388 (Calderon), which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal credit accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. Some of the past projects were determined to have significant adverse impacts on hazards and hazardous materials, including the potential to (1) create a hazard through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or (2) create a hazard through the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The FSAs prepared for all three power plant projects concluded that hazard and hazardous materials impacts could be mitigated to less than significant. For example, according to the CEC, the El Segundo project uses a variety of hazardous materials for storage, use during the construction phase of the project, and for routine plant operation and maintenance (O&M) following construction. Gasoline, diesel, fuel oil, lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paint materials and welding gases are listed in the FSA for use during construction, and O&M materials include but are not limited to aqueous ammonia, lubricating oils, sodium hypochlorite, hydrazine, hydrochloric acid, various gases and piped-in natural gas. The CEC concluded that the transportation and delivery of hazardous materials is routinely regulated and controlled by various federal and state laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. CEC concluded that the following mitigation measures will reduce impacts to less than significant: approval of the compliance project manager (CPM) if the facility intends to store, handle, use or move (or combination of these activities) material above certain quantities; update existing Business Plan; revise the existing Risk Management Plan (RMP); and undertake a feasibility study for the substitution of the 35 percent hydrazine with a less hazardous chemical.

According to the FSA for the Walnut Creek project, there is potential for the transportation, handling, and use of hazardous materials to impact the surrounding community, so all chemicals and natural gas used in the proposed project were evaluated recognizing that some hazardous materials must be used at power plants. Therefore, CEC staff conducted its analysis by examining the choice and amount of chemicals to be used, the manner in which the applicant will use the chemicals, the manner it will be transported to the facility and transferred to facility storage tanks, and the way the applicant plans to store the materials on-site. CEC staff's evaluation of the Walnut Creek project concluded that that hazardous materials use from the proposed project would not present a significant impact to the public as long as the proposed mitigation measures are implemented. The FSA also addressed the issue of the transportation, storage, and use of aqueous ammonia. The proposed project is expected to comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards and the project proponent would be required to develop a Risk Management Plan. The CEC concluded the potential for accidents resulting in the release of hazardous materials is greatly reduced by the implementation of a safety management program, which includes the use of both engineering and administrative controls. Examples of engineering control include secondary containment areas, physical separation of stored chemicals, installation of automatic sprinkler systems and an exhaust system, monitoring systems, and ammonia sensors. Examples of administrative controls include worker training, use of personal protective equipment, safety operating procedures, fire safety and prevention, and emergency response actions. CEC staff believed the risk of exposure to significant concentrations of aqueous ammonia during transportation to the facility are insignificant because of the remote possibility of accidental release of a sufficient quantity to present a danger to the public combined with the already diluted concentration of the aqueous ammonia being transported. The CEC determined that the transportation of similar volumes of hazardous materials on the nation's highways is not unique nor an infrequent occurrence and, thus, concludes that the transportation of aqueous ammonia to the proposed facility and the risk of accident and exposure is less than significant. In addition, according to the CEC, based on the environmental mobility, toxicity, quantities present at the site and frequency of delivery, aqueous ammonia poses the predominate risk associated with hazardous materials transportation and use at the proposed facility. CEC staff concluded, however, that the risk associated with transportation of other hazardous materials to the proposed facility does not significantly increase the risk of impact beyond that associated with ammonia transportation.

The FSA for the Sentinel project stated that aqueous ammonia (29 percent ammonia in aqueous solution) is the only acutely hazardous material proposed to be either used or stored at the site in quantities exceeding the reportable amounts defined in the California Health and Safety Code. The FSA also stated that other hazardous materials, such as mineral and lubricating oils, cleaning detergents, and welding gases, would be present at the Sentinel site, and hazardous materials used during construction would include gasoline, diesel fuel, motor oil, hydraulic fluid, welding gases, lubricants, solvents, paint, and paint thinner. No acutely toxic hazardous materials would be used on site during construction. According to the CEC, none of these materials pose significant potential for off-site impacts as a result of the quantities on site, their relative toxicity, their physical state, and/or their environmental mobility. The CEC staff reviewed and assessed

the potential for the transportation, handling, and use of hazardous materials to impact the surrounding community, and concluded that that hazardous materials use from the proposed project would not present a significant impact to the public as long as the proposed mitigation measures are implemented, and a risk management plan developed prior to delivery of aqueous ammonia to the facility. Similar to the Walnut Creek project, the CEC recommended the Sentinel project to implement a safety management program, which includes the use of both engineering and administrative controls. Examples of engineering control include secondary containment areas, physical separation of stored chemicals, installation of automatic sprinkler systems and an exhaust system, monitoring systems, and ammonia sensors. Examples of administrative controls include worker training, use of personal protective equipment, safety operating procedures, fire safety and prevention, and emergency response actions. To address the issue of spill response, the CEC determined the facility would prepare and implement an emergency response plan that includes information on hazardous materials contingency and emergency response procedures, spill containment and prevention systems, personnel training, spill notification, on-site spill containment, and prevention equipment and capabilities, as well as other elements. Emergency procedures would be established, which include evacuation, spill cleanup, hazard prevention, and emergency response. The FSA for the Sentinel project determined the hazardous materials including aqueous ammonia, which is used for air pollution control, would be transported to the facility by tanker truck, and while many types of hazardous materials would be transported to the site, CEC staff believed that transport of aqueous ammonia poses the predominant risk associated with hazardous materials transport. CEC staff reviewed the technical and scientific literature on hazardous materials transportation accident rates and concluded that the risk of exposure to significant concentrations of aqueous ammonia during transportation to the facility is insignificant because of the remote possibility that an accidental release of a sufficient quantity could be dangerous to the public.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)), and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative hazard and hazardous materials impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." Because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not

feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for hazards and hazardous materials impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of hazards and hazardous materials impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant hazards and hazardous materials impact, the potential exists for future indirect hazards and hazardous materials impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.9**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Additionally, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse hydrology and water quality impacts depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential indirect impacts of the proposed project on water resources and water quality from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential hydrology and water quality impacts is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed project in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse impacts on hydrology and water quality include assessments of impacts to the region's watersheds, rivers, lakes, reservoirs, and groundwater. Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant impacts on water resources and water quality if their implementation would result in any of the following:

#### **Water Quality:**

- The project would result in a violation of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements or any water quality standards.
- The project would cause degradation or depletion of ground water resources substantially affecting current or future uses.

- The project would result in substantial increases in the area of impervious surfaces, such that interference with groundwater recharge efforts occurs.
- The project would result in alterations to the course or flow of floodwaters.
- Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed stormwater drainage systems.
- The project would cause the degradation of surface water quality substantially affecting current or future uses.
- Place housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flow.
- Expose people or structures to risk of loss involving flooding or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.
- The capacities of existing or proposed wastewater treatment facilities and the sanitary sewer system would not be sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

Water Demand:

- The existing water supply would not have the capacity to meet the increased demands of the project, or the project would use a substantial amount of potable water.
- The project would increase demand for water by more than five million gallons per day.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential impacts on water resources and water quality from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on water resources and water quality. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of hydrology and water quality impacts is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse impacts on existing water resources and water quality. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in development adjacent to sensitive resources that could affect the water quality. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant

adverse impacts on hydrology and water quality have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

## **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future. On a programmatic level, impacts to water resources and water quality as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include impacts to water quality, drainage, erosion and siltation, groundwater, and potential impacts related to flooding. Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to water resources that provide the main water supply for a particular area. Activities related to the operation of agricultural facilities may result in significant impacts to water supply and water quality.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.9-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects to existing groundwater and water supplies, particularly the water quality of drinking water supplies, and the conversion of open space areas to agricultural uses that could potentially degrade water quality, on-site and within downstream of receiving water bodies, by significantly increasing the suspended sediment load and/or contributing other pollutant to the natural waterways. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities may result in the following impacts to hydrology and water quality:

- Increased runoff and erosion, which could increase turbidity and decrease water quality in downstream receiving waters;

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents were reviewed since they illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.9-1  
Hydrology & Water Quality Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | LS – Less-than-Significant              |                                       | LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation            |  |                              |                              | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                     |  |  |   | N – No impacts   |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination              |                                       |  |  |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|  | a) Violation of Water Quality Standards | b) Depletion of Ground-water Supplies | c) Alteration of Drainage Pattern Resulting in Erosion | d) Alteration of Drainage Pattern Resulting in Increase Surface Runoff/ Flooding | e) Runoff Exceeding Capacity | f) Water Quality Degradation | g) Placement of Housing within 100-Year Flood Plain | h) Placement of Structures within 100-Year Flood Plain | i) Exposure of people to Flooding or Levee/Dam Failure | j) Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami or Mudflow | k) Exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB | l) Construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities Required | m) Construction of New Storm Water Drainage Facilities Required | n) Sufficiency in Water Supplies to Serve Project | o) Availability of Adequate Wastewater Capacity |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>                                   |   |                                       |  |  |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR                                    | LS                                      | LSM                                   | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LSM                          | LS  | LS   | NE   | NE  | NE   | LS   | NE  | LSM   | NE  |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                               | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | NE   | NE  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                |   |                                       |  |  |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                        | LSM                                     | N                                     | LS   | LS   | N                            | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | N   | N  | N  | N   | N   | N   |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR                                  | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LSM                          | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                   | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | N  | N                            | LSM                          | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LSM  | LSM   | LS  | NE  |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                               | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LSM  | NE  | LSM   | NE  |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                    | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                        | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | NE  | LSM  | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LSM                          | LS  | LS   | N  | N   | LSM  | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                               |   |                                       |  |  |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel  | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LSM                          | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR                                     | LSM                                     | N                                     | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LSM                          | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LSM  | LSM   | LSM   | LS  |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR                                 | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                 | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LSM  | LS                           | LSM                          | N   | N  | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LSM  | LSM                          | LSM                          | N   | N  | N  | NE  | LS   | LS   | NE  | LS  | LS  |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR                                  | LSM                                     | N                                     | LS   | LS   | N                            | N                            | N   | N  | LS   | N   | LS   | LS   | NE  | LS  | LS  |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR                                  | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LSM  | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | N   | LS   | LSM  | LS  | LS  | LS  |

**TABLE 5.9-1 (Continued)**  
**Hydrology & Water Quality Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | LS – Less-than-Significant              |                                       | LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation            |  |                              |                              | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                     |  |  |   | N – No impacts   |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination              |                                       |  |  |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|  | a) Violation of Water Quality Standards | b) Depletion of Ground-water Supplies | c) Alteration of Drainage Pattern Resulting in Erosion | d) Alteration of Drainage Pattern Resulting in Increase Surface Runoff/ Flooding | e) Runoff Exceeding Capacity | f) Water Quality Degradation | g) Placement of Housing within 100-Year Flood Plain | h) Placement of Structures within 100-Year Flood Plain | i) Exposure of people to Flooding or Levee/Dam Failure | j) Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami or Mudflow | k) Exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB | l) Construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities Required | m) Construction of New Storm Water Drainage Facilities Required | n) Sufficiency in Water Supplies to Serve Project | o) Availability of Adequate Wastewater Capacity |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                            | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LSM                          | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LSM  | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | NE   | NE  | LSM  | LSM  | NE  | LSM   | LSM   |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                     |   |                                       |  |  |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR           | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LSM  | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | NE   | N   | LS   | LSM  | NE  | LS  | LS  |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR               | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LSM  | LSM  | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LSM  | LSM  | LS  | LSM   | LS  |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR                                     | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LSM   | LS  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                | LS                                      | N                                     | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LSM  | LS  | LSM   | LS  |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>                                  |   |                                       |  |  |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR                         | LS                                      | N                                     | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | NE   | NE  | LS   | LSM  | NE  | LS  | LS  |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                       | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                     | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | NE                           | NE                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | NE  | LS  | LS  |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                    | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR                              | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | N                            | N   | N  | N  | N   | N  | LS   | N   | LS  | LS  |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR                              | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LSM  | LSM                          | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR                         | LSM                                     | NE                                    | LSM  | LSM  | LSM                          | LS                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                    | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR                               | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR                               | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS   | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LSM   | LSM   |

**TABLE 5.9-1 (Continued)**  
**Hydrology & Water Quality Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | LS – Less-than-Significant              |                                       | LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation            |   |                              |                              | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                     |  |  |   | N – No impacts   |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination              |                                       |  |   |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|  | a) Violation of Water Quality Standards | b) Depletion of Ground-water Supplies | c) Alteration of Drainage Pattern Resulting in Erosion | d) Alteration of Drainage Pattern Resulting in Increase Surface Runoff/Flooding | e) Runoff Exceeding Capacity | f) Water Quality Degradation | g) Placement of Housing within 100-Year Flood Plain | h) Placement of Structures within 100-Year Flood Plain | i) Exposure of people to Flooding or Levee/Dam Failure | j) Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami or Mudflow | k) Exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB | l) Construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities Required | m) Construction of New Storm Water Drainage Facilities Required | n) Sufficiency in Water Supplies to Serve Project | o) Availability of Adequate Wastewater Capacity |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR  | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | NE   | NE  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LSM   | LS  |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.  | LS                                      | N                                     | N  | N   | LSM                          | LS                           | N   | N  | LS   | N   | N  | N  | N   | N   | N   |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LS                           | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LSM                          | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LSM   | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |   |                                       |  |   |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | S                                       | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | S                            | LS  | N  | N  | S   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LS                           | N   | N  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                          | LSM                          | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| <b>Utility Projects (Includes Power Plants)</b>  |   |                                       |  |   |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | LSM                                     | NE                                    | LSM  | LSM   | LSM                          | NE                           | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | LSM  | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LS                           | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE   | NE   | NE  | NE  | NE  |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR  | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LS                           | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR                      | LSM                                     | N                                     | LSM  | LSM   | LS                           | LS                           | N   | LSM  | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>   |   |                                       |  |   |                              |                              |   |  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR   | N                                       | N                                     | N  | LS  | LS                           | N                            | N   | N  | LSM  | LS  | N  | N  | LSM   | N   | N   |

**TABLE 5.9-1 (Concluded)**  
**Hydrology & Water Quality Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant   |  | LS – Less-than-Significant              |                                       | LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation            |   |                              | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |   |   | N – No impacts   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed  |  | Significance Determination              |                                       |  |   |                              |                                 |   |   |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|   |  | a) Violation of Water Quality Standards | b) Depletion of Ground-water Supplies | c) Alteration of Drainage Pattern Resulting in Erosion | d)Alteration of Drainage Pattern Resulting in Increase Surface Runoff/ Flooding | e) Runoff Exceeding Capacity | f) Water Quality Degradation    | g) Placement of Housing within 100-Year Flood Plain | h)Placement of Structures within 100-Year Flood Plain | i) Exposure of people to Flooding or Levee/Dam Failure | j) Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami or Mudflow | k) Exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB | l) Construction of new water or wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities Required | m) Construction of New Storm Water Drainage Facilities Required | n) Sufficiency in Water Supplies to Serve Project | o) Availability of Adequate Wastewater Capacity |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  |  | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LSM  | LSM   | LS                           | LSM                             | N   | N   | N  | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | N   |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  |  | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LSM  | LS  | LS                           | LS                              | NE  | NE  | LS   | LS  | LSM  | LS   | LSM   | LS  | LS  |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   |  | LSM                                     | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LSM                             | N   | N   | N  | N   | LSM  | LSM  | LS  | LSM   | LS  |
| Heavy Industrial Facilities   |  |   |                                       |  |   |                              |                                 |   |   |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   |  | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LS                              | N   | N   | N  | LS  | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   |  | LS                                      | LS                                    | LS   | LS  | LS                           | LS                              | N   | N   | LS   | N   | LS   | LS   | LS  | LS  | LS  |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   |  | N                                       | N                                     | N  | N   | N                            | N                               | N   | N   | N  | N   | N  | N  | N   | N   | N   |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |  |   |                                       |  |   |                              |                                 |   |   |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |

- Increased groundwater pumping necessary to supply water for facility operations, which could lower groundwater levels in the groundwater-bearing materials underlying the site and could interfere with local flow and recharge of existing surface water sources;
- Convert native grassland areas, or other natural habitats, to agricultural uses, which could (1) increase the rate and volume of runoff from the project site and lead to increased bed and accounts erosion within channels draining the project site; (2) potentially degrade water quality, on-site and within downstream receiving water bodies by significantly increasing the suspended sediment load and/or contributing other pollutant to the natural waterways; and (3) potentially increase the rate and volume of runoff from the project site and lead to increased flooding downstream.

However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on hydrology and water quality. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, k) Violation of Standards or Exceedance of Applicable Requirements.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to compliance with applicable water quality standards and wastewater treatment requirements. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing water resources, including surface water bodies and groundwater, resulting in the violation or exceedance of applicable standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on hydrology and water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Depletion of Groundwater Supplies.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact (without or with mitigation) on groundwater resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing groundwater supply issues, which could exacerbate the rate of depletion and create significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on groundwater resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d, e) Drainage Patterns and Capacity.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities to result in significant erosion within the channels draining a project area, increased siltation or flooding, and increased storm water runoff beyond the existing capacities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Water Quality Degradation.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without and with mitigation) on water quality. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing major water quality issues (e.g., high salinity and nitrate levels), which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts on water quality.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g, h, i, j) Flooding.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to flooding. More specifically, both of the CEQA documents identified less-than-significant impacts related to the projects’ location within a 100-year flood zone; the CEQA documents did not address flooding impacts related to levee/dam failure, seiche, tsunami, or

mudflow. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone or areas subject to inundation and create significant adverse impacts related to flooding.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and inundation from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**l, m, n, o) Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, and Storm Drainage).** One of the two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems. The other CEQA document only disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without and with mitigation) related to water supplies and facilities and wastewater treatment facilities; this document did not address impacts to storm drain facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing deficiencies in its infrastructure services, which could exacerbate the need for facility upgrades, and create significant adverse impacts on the existing water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas. Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry

businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential for alteration of existing hydrological conditions, water resources, and water quality. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts to hydrology and water quality in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail/service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.9-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities. Based on a review of these documents, retail service facilities may result in the following impacts to hydrology and water quality:

- Adverse impacts may result from the release of contaminants into the stormwater drainage channels during the routine operation of retail/service development projects. Potential water quality issues are associated with stormwater runoff across existing paved areas and streets that have accumulated fuel, oil, grease, and trash deposits.
- During construction, grading activities could potentially result in a temporary increase in the amount of suspended solids running off the site. In the event of rainfall, construction site runoff originating from the project site could result in sheet erosion of exposed soil, which could affect surface water quality in the vicinity of the project site, as well as water resources located downstream from the project site. Therefore, construction-related erosion could result in a potentially significant impact to surface water quality.
- The construction of foundations for retail service buildings and subterranean parking structures could have the potential to interfere with groundwater by intercepting the aquifer during excavation. Therefore, project construction could result in a significant impact to groundwater or groundwater quality.
- All of the projects surveyed for the retail/service facility category were identified to be located in impervious areas (i.e., areas that are currently developed with structures or pavement). Due to the existing impervious nature of the project sites, the retail service projects were found to not substantially alter existing drainage patterns on the project sites or surrounding areas or substantially increase the amount of water flowing from the site. Based on the existing and proposed impervious conditions, the amount and quality of stormwater were found to not change substantially.

- All of the projects surveyed for the retail/service facility category were located in urban areas where adequate water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure exists. Therefore, implementation of these retail service projects were found to not have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with existing infrastructure and capacity.

These projects were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on hydrology and water quality. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, k) Violation of Standards or Exceedance of Applicable Requirements.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to compliance with applicable water quality standards and wastewater treatment requirements. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited on contaminated parcels or in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing water resources, including surface water bodies and groundwater, resulting in the violation or exceedance of applicable standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on hydrology and water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Depletion of Groundwater Supplies.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact or no impact on groundwater resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing groundwater supply issues or shallow groundwater areas, which could exacerbate the rate of depletion and create significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on groundwater resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) Drainage Patterns and Capacity.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities to result in significant increases in flooding and storm water runoff beyond the capacities of existing drainage systems.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the additional considerations identified in the preceding paragraph, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**f) Water Quality Degradation.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts or no impact on water quality. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing major water quality issues (e.g., sites with contaminated soils and/or groundwater), which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts on water quality.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**g, h, i, j) Flooding.** Seven of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to flooding; one CEQA document did not address any impacts related to flooding. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone or areas subject to inundation and create significant adverse impacts related to flooding.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and inundation from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**l, m, n, o) Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, and Storm Drainage).** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing deficiencies in its infrastructure services, which could exacerbate the need for facility upgrades, and create significant adverse impacts on the existing water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drainage systems.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas. Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings and parking structures/lots. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of existing hydrological conditions, water resources, and water quality. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in

significant adverse impacts to hydrology and water quality in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.9-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found to result in the release of contaminants into the stormwater drainage channels during the routine operation of large commercial development projects, temporary increases in the amount of suspended solids running off the site during construction, potential to interfere with groundwater by intercepting the aquifer during excavation, alteration of existing drainage patterns on the project sites and surrounding areas, and relocation of utility lines, including water lines, sewer lines, and storm water drainage. However, project-specific impacts were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on hydrology and water quality. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, k) Violation of Standards or Exceedance of Applicable Requirements.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to compliance with applicable water quality standards and wastewater treatment requirements. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited on contaminated parcels or in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing water resources, including surface water bodies and groundwater, resulting in the violation or exceedance of applicable standards.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on hydrology and water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Depletion of Groundwater Supplies.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact or no impact on groundwater resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing groundwater supply issues or shallow groundwater areas, which could exacerbate the rate of depletion and create significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on groundwater resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d, e) Drainage Patterns and Capacity.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities to result in significant increases in flooding and storm water runoff beyond the capacities of existing drainage systems.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Water Quality Degradation.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on water quality. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing major water quality issues (e.g., sites with contaminated soils and/or groundwater), which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts on water quality.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g, h, i, j) Flooding.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to flooding. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone or areas subject to inundation and create significant adverse impacts related to flooding.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and inundation from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- l, m, n, o) Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, and Storm Drainage).** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing deficiencies in its infrastructure services, which could exacerbate the need for facility upgrades, and create significant adverse impacts on the existing water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, some of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities are anticipated to be developed in the future. Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to alter undeveloped open space and natural areas that may result in the alteration of existing hydrological conditions, water resources, and water quality. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse impacts on water resources and water quality.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.9-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, parking lots, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were found to result in the release of contaminants into the stormwater drainage channels during the routine operation of entertainment/recreational development projects, temporary increases in the amount of suspended solids running off the site during construction, alteration of existing drainage patterns on the project sites and surrounding areas, and relocation of utility lines, including water lines, sewer lines, and storm water drainage. However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on hydrology and water quality. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, k) Violation of Standards or Exceedance of Applicable Requirements.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to compliance with applicable water quality standards and wastewater treatment requirements. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained

offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing water resources, including surface water bodies and groundwater, resulting in the violation or exceedance of applicable standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on hydrology and water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Depletion of Groundwater Supplies.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact or no impact on groundwater resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing groundwater supply issues or shallow groundwater areas, which could exacerbate the rate of depletion and create significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on groundwater resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d, e) Drainage Patterns and Capacity.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on the existing drainage patterns and capacities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities to result in significant increases in flooding and storm water runoff beyond the capacities of existing drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**f) Water Quality Degradation.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on water quality. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing major water quality issues (e.g., sites with contaminated soils and/or groundwater or near water resources), which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts on water quality.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**g, h, i, j) Flooding.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to flooding. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone or areas subject to inundation and create significant adverse impacts related to flooding.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and inundation from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**l, m, n, o) Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, and Storm Drainage).** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing deficiencies in its infrastructure services, which could exacerbate the need for facility upgrades, and create significant adverse impacts on the existing water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas. Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and parking lots. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and would, therefore, would have a low potential alteration of existing hydrological conditions, water resources, and water quality. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant adverse impacts to hydrology and water quality in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to have significant impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.9-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities, which were found to result in the release of contaminants into the stormwater drainage channels during the routine operation of institutional projects, temporary increases in the amount of suspended solids running off the site during construction, potential to interfere with groundwater by penetrating the water table during excavation, alteration of existing drainage patterns on the project sites and surrounding areas, and relocation of utility lines, including water lines, sewer lines, and storm water drainage. However, project-specific impacts were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures

on hydrology and water quality. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, k) Violation of Standards or Exceedance of Applicable Requirements.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to compliance with applicable water quality standards and wastewater treatment requirements. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing water resources, including surface water bodies and groundwater, resulting in the violation or exceedance of applicable standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on hydrology and water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Depletion of Groundwater Supplies.** Fourteen of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact or no impact on groundwater resources; the other CEQA document did not address impacts to groundwater resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing groundwater supply issues or shallow groundwater areas, which could exacerbate the rate of depletion and create significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on groundwater resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) Drainage Patterns and Capacity.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that

could create significant adverse impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities to result in significant increases in flooding and storm water runoff beyond the capacities of existing drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Water Quality Degradation.** Fourteen of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on water quality; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on water quality. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing major water quality issues (e.g., sites with contaminated soils and/or groundwater), which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts on water quality.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g, h, i, j) Flooding.** Fourteen of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to flooding; the other CEQA document did not address impacts to flooding. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone or areas subject to inundation and create significant adverse impacts related to flooding.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and inundation from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**l, m, n, o) Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, and Storm Drainage).** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing deficiencies in its infrastructure services, which could exacerbate the need for facility upgrades, and create significant adverse impacts on the existing water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, the number of transportation facilities that would require stationary-source permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities. Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities). Any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of existing hydrological conditions, water resources, and water quality. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts on hydrology and water quality.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.9-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, and bus storage and maintenance facilities, some of which were found to result in the release of contaminants into the stormwater drainage channels during the routine operation of transportation projects, temporary increases in the amount of suspended solids running off the site during construction, alteration of existing drainage patterns on the project sites and surrounding areas, and relocation of utility lines, including water lines, sewer lines, and storm water drainage. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, k) Violation of Standards or Exceedance of Applicable Requirements.** For some of the projects in the transportation facility category, environmental impacts related to compliance with applicable water standards and wastewater treatment requirements were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, for other projects, the lead agencies concluded that the transportation facility category project has the potential to violate applicable water quality standards, such as those disclosed for the Project # 39, TraPac Terminal Expansion Project, which was found to have a potential to increase incidental spills and illegal discharges due to increased vessel calls at the port terminal; leaching of contaminants, such as copper from anti-fouling paint, could also cause increased loading in the harbor, which was listed as impaired with respect to copper.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on hydrology and water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Depletion of Groundwater Supplies.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact or no impact on groundwater resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing groundwater supply issues or shallow groundwater areas, which could exacerbate the rate of depletion and create significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on groundwater resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d, e) Drainage Patterns and Capacity.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on the existing drainage patterns and capacities. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities to result in significant increases in flooding and storm water runoff beyond the capacities of existing drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Water Quality Degradation.** For some of the projects in the transportation facility category, environmental impacts related to water quality degradation were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, for other projects, the lead agencies concluded that the transportation facility category project has the potential to degrade water quality, such as those disclosed for the Project # 39, TraPac Terminal Expansion Project, which was found to have a potential to increase incidental spills and illegal discharges due to increased vessel calls at the port terminal; leaching of contaminants, such as copper from anti-fouling paint, could also cause increased loading in the harbor, which was listed as impaired with respect to copper.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g, h, i, j) Flooding.** For some of the projects in the transportation facility category, environmental impacts related to flooding and inundation were either less-than-significant or no impact. However, for other projects, the lead agencies concluded that the transportation facility category project has the potential to degrade water quality, such as those disclosed for the Project # 39, TraPac Terminal Expansion

Project, which determined that project construction within the Port area would expose people and structures to substantial risk involving tsunamis or seiches.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on flooding and inundation from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**l, m, n, o) Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, and Storm Drainage).** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems; the other CEQA document did not address impacts to the existing infrastructure. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing deficiencies in its infrastructure services, which could exacerbate the need for facility upgrades, and create significant adverse impacts on the existing water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drainage systems.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on the historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to

the necessity and the distributed nature of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Any new utility project would most likely be constructed within an already developed area and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of existing hydrological conditions, water resources, and water quality. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts on hydrology and water quality.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.9-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, could result in the release of contaminants into the stormwater drainage channels during the routine operation, temporary increases in the amount of suspended solids running off the site during construction, alteration of existing drainage patterns on the project sites and surrounding areas, and relocation of utility lines, including water lines, sewer lines, and storm water drainage. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, k) Violation of Standards or Exceedance of Applicable Requirements.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to compliance with applicable water quality standards and wastewater treatment requirements. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing water resources, including surface water bodies and groundwater, resulting in the violation or exceedance of applicable standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on hydrology and water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Depletion of Groundwater Supplies.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed a less-than-significant

impact or no impact on groundwater resources; the other CEQA document did not address impacts to groundwater resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing groundwater supply issues or shallow groundwater areas, which could exacerbate the rate of depletion and create significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on groundwater resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) Drainage Patterns and Capacity.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on the existing drainage patterns and capacities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities to result in significant increases in flooding and storm water runoff beyond the capacities of existing drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**f) Water Quality Degradation.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on water quality; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on water quality. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing major water quality issues (e.g., sites with contaminated soils and/or groundwater), which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts on water quality.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time

the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**g, h, i, j) Flooding.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to flooding; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts to flooding. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone or areas subject to inundation and create significant adverse impacts related to flooding

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and inundation from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**l, m, n, o) Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, and Storm Drainage).** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts regarding the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing deficiencies in its infrastructure services, which could exacerbate the need for facility upgrades, and create significant adverse impacts on the existing water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas. Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings. Any new light industrial/warehouse facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial and commercial-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of existing hydrological conditions, water resources, and water quality. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts on hydrology and water quality.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.9-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, effects on water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in (1) increases in the amount of impervious surfaces within a development area, (2) increase in the potential for stormwater to come into contact with sediment, debris, and urban pollutants and discharge to adjacent surface waters during both the construction and operations period, (3) and changes in the amount of impervious surface area on-site to alter the existing drainage patterns, and (4) relocation of utility lines, including water lines, sewer lines, and storm water drainage. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, k) Violation of Standards or Exceedance of Applicable Requirements.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impact related to compliance with applicable water quality standards and wastewater treatment requirements. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on

existing water resources, including surface water bodies and groundwater, resulting in the violation or exceedance of applicable standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on hydrology and water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Depletion of Groundwater Supplies.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact or no impact on groundwater resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing groundwater supply issues or shallow groundwater areas, which could exacerbate the rate of depletion and create significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on groundwater resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d, e) Drainage Patterns and Capacity.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on the existing drainage patterns and capacities. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities to result in significant increases in flooding and storm water runoff beyond the capacities of existing drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Water Quality Degradation.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant

impacts (without and with mitigation) or no impact on water quality. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing major water quality issues (e.g., sites with contaminated soils and/or groundwater), which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts on water quality.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**g, h, i, j) Flooding.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to flooding. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone or areas subject to inundation and create significant adverse impacts related to flooding.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and inundation from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**l, m, n, o) Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, and Storm Drainage).** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing deficiencies in its infrastructure services, which could exacerbate the need for facility upgrades, and create significant adverse impacts on the existing water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas. Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. Any new heavy industrial facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial and commercial-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of existing hydrological conditions, water resources, and water quality. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts on hydrology and water quality.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.9-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could generate (1) increases in the amount of impervious surfaces within a development area, (2) an increase in the potential for stormwater to come into contact with sediment, debris, and urban pollutants and discharge to adjacent surface waters during both the construction and operations period, (3) changes in the amount of impervious surface area on-site to alter the existing drainage patterns, and (4) relocation of utility lines, including water lines, sewer lines, and storm water drainage. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, k) Violation of Standards or Exceedance of Applicable Requirements.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to compliance with applicable water quality standards and wastewater treatment requirements. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing water resources, including surface water bodies and groundwater, resulting in the violation or exceedance of applicable standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on hydrology and water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Depletion of Groundwater Supplies.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact on groundwater resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing groundwater supply issues or shallow groundwater areas, which could exacerbate the rate of depletion and create significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on groundwater resources from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) Drainage Patterns and Capacity.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities to result in significant increases in flooding and storm water runoff beyond the capacities of existing drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing drainage patterns and capacities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Water Quality Degradation.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact on water quality. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing major water quality issues (e.g., sites with contaminated soils and/or groundwater), which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts on water quality.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts on water quality from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g, h, i, j) Flooding.** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to flooding. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone or areas subject to inundation and create significant adverse impacts related to flooding.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and inundation from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- l, m, n, o) Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, and Storm Drainage).** All of the CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts

in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is already experiencing deficiencies in its infrastructure services, which could exacerbate the need for facility upgrades, and create significant adverse impacts on the existing water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drainage systems.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to hydrology and water quality could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the adequacy of the existing infrastructure within the district, including water supplies and facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, and storm drain systems from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to hydrology and water quality that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documentation found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff’s independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, hydrology and water quality impacts as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other “past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects.” [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal credit accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);

- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez) and proposed SB 388 (Calderon), which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal credit accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. Past development patterns within the district have resulted in a variety of altered or new man-made hydrological conditions. The region consists of many different hydrological basins, catchment areas, and countless man-made drainage systems along streets, residential areas, and developed urban centers. While there is a large amount of impervious, paved, and developed land within the district, there are also large areas of undeveloped natural drainage in the mountainous and less developed regions in the eastern portion of the district. Thus, the hydrological environment differs greatly from location to location. Therefore, any future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts would potentially result in new or altered hydrological conditions, that may affect local or regional water quality in various parts of the district. As noted above, since the specific location of individual facilities cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative hydrological and water quality impacts is even more uncertain.

However, some of the past projects were determined to have significant adverse impacts on hydrology and water quality, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable water quality and wastewater treatment standards, alteration of existing drainage patterns, increased surface water runoff, water quality degradation, water supplies, and wastewater conveyance and treatment capacities.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The FSAs prepared by the CEC for all three power plant projects determined the significant impacts to hydrology and water quality could be mitigated to less than significant. For example, according to the CEC, water demand for the El Segundo project is estimated at 207 million gallons per day (gpd) at full operation and are proposed to be supplied from a combination of sources, including the City of El Segundo

through Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. The proposed once-through cooling system for the ESPR project would use large quantities of water, pulling cool water from the Santa Monica Bay and returning almost all of the water, warmed, to the Bay. According to the CEC, the discharge of the cooling water through the Hyperion outfall would result in an average temperature rise of seven degrees, but under worst case conditions could be as much as 19.5 degrees above the existing discharge temperature at the discharge point. The FSA states the El Segundo project will be using approximately 180,000 gpd potable water for the makeup water for the evaporative coolers, heat recovery steam generator blowdown, quench water, and miscellaneous plant uses. Various options to mitigate the adverse impacts on water quality and demand, such as using reclaimed water instead of seawater or potable water, were discussed in the FSA. According to the FSA for the El Segundo project, the West Basin Municipal Water District will supply approximately 86,000 gpd of reclaimed water for both irrigation and for pumps and bearings seal water augmentation mitigating the need for treated (potable) water. Sanitary wastewater discharges, according to the FSA, will be directed to the existing City of Manhattan Beach Municipal Sanitary Sewer System and existing policies in the California Coastal Act of 1976 prevent depletion of groundwater supplies and substantial interference with surface water flow. Since the site lies at approximately 19 feet above sea level, and might be afforded some protection by the existing sea wall, the CEC concluded no significant impacts from a tsunami are anticipated at the El Segundo facility. In light of the historical performance of California power plants and the electrical system in seismic events, CEC staff believes there is no special concern with power plant functional reliability affecting the electric system's reliability due to seismic events.

The FSA prepared by the CEC for the Walnut Creek project would comply with all applicable water resource laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards and that potential significant impacts would be mitigated through the preparation of construction and operation plans and the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would mitigate problems related to contamination to surface and groundwater, use of potable water supplies, or non-compliance with wastewater treatment and discharge requirements. The CEC reports the Walnut Creek project would use less than 12,000 gallons per day of reclaimed water, primarily for dust control during construction. The FSA states the project would provide chlorine treatment of the reclaimed water, utilizing a 180,000 gallon tank to provide a minimum of 90 minutes contact time for disinfection with an additional 180,000 gallon tank to store the treated reclaimed water for process uses, and provide approximately 1.5 hours of onsite operational storage if reclaimed water supply were disrupted. In the event of a disruption in reclaimed water supply, the Walnut Creek project would benefit from storage of five to nine million gallons, so there is no adverse impact to water supply. Potentially significant construction wastewater and stormwater runoff will be managed to maintain compliance with the required Drainage, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (DESCP) that ensures protection of water quality. Other mitigation includes: developing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction and operation; obtaining a Flood Permit and Water Quality Agreement for commercial connection to the Los Angeles County's flood control system; submitting a Dual Plumbing Plan to local health services department for use of reclaimed and potable water; using reclaimed water as its primary water supply for

construction and operations, including cooling, process, and other approved non-potable use; monitoring the use of emergency backup water; securing a Water Supply Service Agreement from local water districts for reclaimed and potable water service; obtaining a Permit for Industrial Wastewater Discharge; and complying with the wastewater discharge limitations, pretreatment requirements, peak flow restrictions, dewatering discharges, payment of fees, and monitoring and reporting requirements of Los Angeles County Sanitation District. Finally, according to the FSA, the Walnut Creek project would not alter the existing drainage patterns, not result in increased runoff volumes, and is not near any large body of water where a potential tsunami or seiche could affect the site.

According to the FSA for the Sentinel project, groundwater from onsite wells or that serves local municipal needs would be used to meet the potable water demands for the project's operation workforce and plant processes (cooling, fire protection, and landscape irrigation) at a maximum of 1,100 acre-foot per year (AFY) and, during construction, an average of 25,000 gallons per day of groundwater would be used primarily for dust suppression and vehicle washing with a portion of this water use returning to the groundwater basin. The FSA states that during hydrotesting of the natural gas pipeline, a maximum of 250,000 gallons per day of groundwater could be used and, after the hydrotesting event, this wastewater would either be trucked to a treatment and disposal facility or percolated onsite depending on the results of water analysis. With respect to the potential for significant impacts associated with the project's extraction of groundwater, CEC staff believes the applicant's proposal to import new water for recharge at 108 percent of the project's use would mitigate the depletion of groundwater. The estimated annual potable water demand for operation is two AFY and during construction, potable water use would be limited to drinking water provided in bottles, and waterless portable facilities would be used for sanitary needs. According to the CEC, water quality could be impacted by discharge of eroded sediments from the site, discharge of hazardous materials released during construction, or migration of existing hazardous materials present in the subsurface soil and groundwater. During operation, the FSA states that water quality could be impacted by discharge of eroded sediments from the Sentinel site, discharge of hazardous materials released during operation, or migration of existing hazardous materials present in the subsurface soils and groundwater. The CEC determined that the project's DESCP and SWPPP has included BMPs for wind and water erosion control and storm water management during project construction and operation that would maintain water quality to an impact that is less than significant. The FSA reports that the sanitary wastewater system would collect wastewater from sinks, toilets, and other sanitary facilities for discharge to an onsite septic system as permitted and in accordance with the Riverside County ordinances and standards. The CEC concluded that the Sentinel site is not located within the 100-year floodplain, is too far inland to be affected by tsunami and too far from a large water body to be affected by seiche.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)), and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts.

## **Mitigation Measures for Future Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse hydrology and water quality impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for hydrology and water quality impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of hydrology and water quality impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant hydrology and water quality impact, the potential exists for future indirect hydrology and water quality impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.10**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - LAND USE AND PLANNING**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse land use and planning impacts depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential indirect impacts the proposed project on land use and planning from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential land use impacts is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed projects in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse land use impacts include assessments of impacts to established communities, land use plans, and conservation plans, which may be caused by future new projects. Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant land use and planning impacts if their implementation would result in the following:

- Physically divide an established community.
- Land use and planning impacts would be considered significant if the project conflicts with the land use and zoning designations established by local jurisdictions.
- Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential land use impacts from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on land use and planning for a given area. Based on the methodology described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts related to land use and planning is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse land use impacts. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in facilities and developments that could divide an existing community; conflict with adopted land use designations, zoning requirements, or ordinances; or conflict with adopted habitat or natural community conservation plans. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse land use and planning impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.10-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to land use and planning as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include division of established communities (e.g., agricultural facilities which prevent access for community residents), conflicts with adopted land use plans (e.g., conversion of residential, commercial, industrial, or public

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

**TABLE 5.10-1  
Land Use and Planning Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| S – Significant   |  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>        |  |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |  | N – No impacts                         |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |  |  |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b>          |  |  |
|   | <b>a) Division of Existing Communities</b> | <b>b) Conflict with Land Use Plans</b> | <b>c) Conflict with Conservation Plans</b> |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>  |  |  |  |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR   | N  | LSM                                    | N  |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                                      | LS   | LS                                     | LS   |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                       |  |  |  |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                               | LS   | LS                                     | N  |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR   | LS   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                          | N  | LSM                                    | N  |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                                      | LS   | S                                      | LS   |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                           | LS   | LS                                     | N  |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                       | N  | N                                      | N  |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                               | LS   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR  | LS   | LS                                     | NE   |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                                      |  |  |  |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel   | LS   | LSM                                    | N  |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR  | LS   | LS                                     | NE   |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR  | N  | LS                                     | N  |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                        | N  | LSM                                    | N  |

**TABLE 5.10-1 (Continued)**  
**Land Use and Planning Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>            |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                             |  |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |  |  |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b>          |  |  |
|   | <b>a) Division of Existing Communities</b> | <b>b) Conflict with Land Use Plans</b> | <b>c) Conflict with Conservation Plans</b> |
| 15. Panorama Palace Project EIR   | N  | LS                                     | NE   |
| 16. Metro Universal Project EIR   | LS   | S                                      | LS   |
| 17. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                                   | N  | LS                                     | N  |
| 18. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                       | LS   | LS                                     | LS   |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                            |  |  |  |
| 19. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR                  | N  | LSM                                    | N  |
| 20. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR                      | LS   | LS                                     | N  |
| 21. Canyon Hills Project EIR  | LS   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 22. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                       | N  | LS                                     | N  |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>   |  |  |  |
| 23. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR                                | NE   | LS                                     | NE   |
| 24. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                              | LS   | LS                                     | N  |
| 25. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                            | N  | N                                      | N  |
| 26. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                           | N  | LS                                     | N  |
| 27. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR                                     | N  | LS                                     | N  |
| 28. New Paradise Church Project EIR                                     | N  | LS                                     | N  |
| 29. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR                                | LS   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 30. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                           | LS   | LS                                     | N  |
| 31. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR                                      | LS   | LS                                     | N  |

**TABLE 5.10-1 (Continued)**  
**Land Use and Planning Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>     |                                 |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   | N – No impacts                      |                                 |                                     |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |                                     |                                 |                                     |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination          |                                 |                                     |
|  | a) Division of Existing Communities | b) Conflict with Land Use Plans | c) Conflict with Conservation Plans |
| 32. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | N                                   | LS                              | N                                   |
| 33. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR  | N                                   | LS                              | N                                   |
| 34. West LA College EIR  | LS                                  | LS                              | LS                                  |
| 35. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.  | N                                   | N                               | N                                   |
| 36. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | LSM                                 | LS                              | NE                                  |
| 37. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | N                                   | LS                              | N                                   |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |                                     |                                 |                                     |
| 38. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | LSM                                 | LS                              | LSM                                 |
| 39. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | N                                   | LS                              | N                                   |
| 40. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LSM                                 | LSM                             | NE                                  |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>  |                                     |                                 |                                     |
| 41. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | NE                                  | LS                              | LS                                  |
| 42. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | N                                   | N                               | N                                   |
| 43. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR  | N                                   | LS                              | N                                   |
| 44. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR                      | LS                                  | LS                              | N                                   |
| <b>Light/Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>   |                                     |                                 |                                     |
| 45. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR   | N                                   | LSM                             | N                                   |

**TABLE 5.10-1 (Concluded)**  
**Land Use and Planning Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant   |                                     | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |                                     | N – No impacts                  |                                     |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |                                     |                                 |                                     |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed  | Significance Determination          |                                 |                                     |
|   | a) Division of Existing Communities | b) Conflict with Land Use Plans | c) Conflict with Conservation Plans |
| 46. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | LSM                                 | LSM                             | LSM                                 |
| 47. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | LS                                  | LS                              | LS                                  |
| 48. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | N                                   | LS                              | N                                   |
| Heavy Industrial Facilities   |                                     |                                 |                                     |
| 49. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | N                                   | N                               | N                                   |
| 50. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LS                                  | LS                              | LS                                  |
| 51. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N                                   | N                               | N                                   |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |                                     |                                 |                                     |

lands to agricultural use), and/or conflict with adopted conservation plans (e.g., affecting natural habitats or migratory corridors due to agricultural land uses).

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.0-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on land use and planning. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities are typically constructed and operated within areas zoned for agriculture and are likely to be consistent with adopted plans and policies.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

Therefore, these facilities are unlikely to conflict with land use and conservation plans. Accordingly, these projects in the identified CEQA documents were found to have less-than-significant land use and planning impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of land use impacts identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

- a) **Division of Existing Communities.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed either no impact or a less-than-significant impact on existing communities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create physical barriers or divisions in an established community such that significant adverse impacts on existing communities could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting from the division of existing communities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Conflict with Adopted Land Use Plans.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the projects' consistency with land use plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable land use plans and policies.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable land use plans from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Conflict with Adopted Conservation Plans.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed either no impact or less-than-significant impact on existing conservation plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable conservation plans for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects’ consistency with applicable adopted conservation plans and regulations from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the last five years. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential of creating divisions within an existing community or conflicts with adopted land use and conservation plans. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse land use and planning impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse land use impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail/service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.10-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on land use and planning, which involve conflict or inconsistency with adopted plans or policies of agencies with jurisdiction over the projects analyzed. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings, some of which were found to result in conflicts with existing plans and policies. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts in the identified CEQA documents as most retail and service establishments surveyed are located in developed urban areas and are largely compatible with regional and local plans, conservation plans, and generally do not result in divisions of existing communities. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of land use impacts identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Division of Existing Communities.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant

impacts on existing communities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create physical barriers or divisions in an established community such that significant adverse impacts on existing communities could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting from the division of existing communities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Adopted Land Use Plans.** For most of the projects in the retail/service facility category, environmental impacts resulting from conflicts with adopted plans or policies were concluded to be either less-than-significant or no impact. However, for one project surveyed (Project # 6 – Archstone Hollywood), the lead agency concluded that this retail/service facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse land use impacts resulting from the need to change the zoning designation for the project site (industrial to commercial retail). In addition, future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with adopted local and regional plans and policies, resulting in potentially significant adverse impacts to land use plans.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the additional considerations identified in the preceding paragraph, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on land use plans from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Conflict with Adopted Conservation Plans.** Seven of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts on the conservation plans of the affected areas; the other CEQA document did not discuss the project's conservation plan consistency. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable conservation plans for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant.

Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable adopted conservation plans and regulations from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential of creating divisions within an existing community or conflicts with adopted land use and conservation plans. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse land use and planning impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant adverse land use impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.10-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on land use and planning, including the creation of divisions within existing communities and conflicts with the land use and conservation plans of the immediate project area. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, some of which were found to result in changes to the zoning code of the surrounding community, conflict with historic resource conservation ordinances, and other general land use plan conflicts. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant in the identified CEQA documents since most of the commercial facilities are located in developed urban areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding land uses, plans, and conservation policies. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of land use impacts identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Division of Existing Communities.** Eight of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on existing communities; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts regarding division of existing communities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this

facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create physical barriers or divisions in an established community such that significant adverse impacts on existing communities could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting from the division of existing communities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Land Use Plans.** For most of the projects in the large commercial facility category, environmental impacts resulting from conflicts with adopted plans or policies were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for one project surveyed (Project # 17 – Metro Universal), the lead agency concluded that this large commercial facility category project has the potential to generate significant adverse land use impacts resulting from conflicts with adopted land use plans due to inconsistencies with building height and zoning requirements. In addition, future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with adopted local and regional plans and policies, resulting in potentially significant adverse impacts to land use plans.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on land use plans from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Conflict with Adopted Conservation Plan.** Six of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts on the conservation plans of the affected areas; the other three CEQA documents did not discuss the projects' conservation plan consistencies. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable conservation plans for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable adopted conservation plans and regulations from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, some of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities are anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to create structures or developments that could physically divide an existing community or conflict with adopted land use and/or conservation plans of an area. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse land use and planning impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.10-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on land use and planning, including changes that would result in physical division of an existing community; conflict with adopted land use plans, ordinances, and policies; or conflict with adopted conservation plans. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, outdoor lighting and signage, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were determined to result in conflicts with adopted land use plans and zoning requirements. Accordingly, these projects in the identified CEQA documents were found to have no significant land use and planning impacts. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of land use impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Division of Existing Communities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on existing communities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create physical barriers or divisions in an established community such that significant adverse impacts on existing communities could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time

the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting from the division of existing communities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Adopted Land Use Plans.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the projects' consistency with land use plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable land use plans and policies.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable land use plans from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Conflict with Adopted Conservation Plans.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either no impacts or a less-than-significant impact on existing conservation plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable conservation plans for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable adopted conservation plans and regulations from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and, therefore, would have a low potential to create new divisions within an existing community or to conflict with adopted land use and conservation plans. Therefore, these future facilities would have a low likelihood of resulting in significant land use and planning impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse land use and planning impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.10-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on land use and planning, including the creation of physical divisions of the surround communities, conflict with adopted local and regional land use plans, and conflict with adopted local and regional conservation plans. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities, some of which were found to result in incompatible land uses with the surrounding community possibly leading to a reduction or degradation of the existing community's character. However, these projects were generally found to have less-than-significant land use and planning impacts in the identified CEQA documents as most of these projects are located in developed urban areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding resources and land uses. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of land use impacts identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Division of Existing Communities.** Fourteen of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on existing communities; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create physical barriers or divisions in an established community such that significant adverse impacts on existing communities could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant.

Therefore, impacts due to physical divisions of existing communities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Adopted Land Use Plans.** The fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts related to the projects' consistency with land use plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable land use plans and policies.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable land use plans from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Conflict with Adopted Conservation Plans.** Thirteen of the fifteen CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on existing conservation plans; the other two CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable conservation plans for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable adopted conservation plans and regulations from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not

constitute a large number (based on historical data, as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting. However, any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential to divide and existing community or to conflict with adopted land use and/or conservation plans. Therefore, transportation facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant land use and planning impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts on land use and planning.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.10-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on land use and planning, including creating divisions within an existing community, and conflicts with adopted land use and conservation plans of an area. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, bus storage and maintenance facilities, and mixed-use residential and commercial facilities, some of which were found to result in divisions of existing communities and conflicts with land use and conservation plans. However, the CEQA documents for the projects that were surveyed were found to have less-than-significant land use and planning impacts as most of these projects were located in developed mixed-use, industrial, and commercial zoned areas and are largely compatible with the surrounding land uses. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of land use impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Division of Existing Communities.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures or no impacts on existing communities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create physical barriers or divisions in an established community such that significant adverse impacts on existing communities could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time

the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting from divisions created within existing communities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Adopted Land Use Plans.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the projects' consistency with land use plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable land use plans and policies.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable land use plans from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Conflict with Adopted Conservation Plans.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either no impact or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on existing conservation plans; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable conservation plans for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable adopted conservation plans and regulations from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on the historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities are not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage

facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity and the distributed nature of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Although these facilities would typically be constructed in industrial zoned areas, these facilities may be sited near or directly adjacent to sensitive residential neighborhoods and publicly accessible scenic areas. The potential scale and height of exhaust structures, flares, and other functional components of a typical large scale utility project may result in land use and planning impacts to surrounding non-industrial land uses. Accordingly, it is likely that a number of conflicts may occur regarding the surrounding communities and land uses of an area. Therefore, future construction and operation of utility facilities would likely generate significant adverse land use and planning impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.10-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on land use and planning, including divisions of existing communities and conflicts with adopted land use and conservation plans. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, could generate conflicts with the surrounding land uses that could result in significant adverse impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of land use impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Division of Existing Communities.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either no impacts or a less-than-significant impact on existing communities; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create physical barriers or divisions in an established community such that significant adverse impacts on existing communities could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant.

Therefore, impacts resulting from divisions created within existing communities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Adopted Land Use Plans.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to the projects' consistency with land use plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable land use plans and policies.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable land use plans from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Conflict with Adopted Conservation Plans.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either no impacts or a less-than-significant impact on existing conservation plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable conservation plans for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable adopted conservation plans and regulations from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would

likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings that could require outdoor lighting and moderate amounts of construction activities, which may result in significant adverse land use and planning impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.10-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on land use and planning, including creation of divisions within existing communities and conflicts with adopted land use and conservation plans. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in conflicts with adopted land use plans. However, adverse effects were not found to be significant in the identified CEQA documents since most of these facilities were located in developed urban industrial areas and largely compatible with the surrounding land uses. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of land use and planning impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Division of Existing Communities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures or no impacts on existing communities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create physical barriers or divisions in an established community such that significant adverse impacts on existing communities could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting from divisions created within existing communities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Conflict with Adopted Land Use Plans.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the projects' consistency with land use plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable land use plans and policies.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time

the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable land use plans from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Conflict with Adopted Conservation Plans.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on existing conservation plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable conservation plans for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable adopted conservation plans and regulations from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. These facilities typically require outdoor lighting, smoke stacks, flares, and other industrial structures which have the potential to conflict with the land use and conservation plans of adjacent non-industrial areas. Accordingly, it is likely that these types of project would have an adverse impact on the surrounding land uses and communities. Therefore, these future heavy industrial facilities have the potential of generating significant adverse land use and planning impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.10-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on land use and planning, including divisions to existing communities and conflicts with adopted land use and conservation plans. Based on the

evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could create divisions within the surrounding community and conflicts with land use and conservation plans despite the conclusions in the surveyed CEQA documents. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of land use and planning impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Division of Existing Communities.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts on existing communities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create physical barriers or divisions in an established community such that significant adverse impacts on existing communities could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting from divisions created within existing communities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Conflict with Adopted Land Use Plans.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact or no impacts related to the projects' consistency with land use plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable land use plans and policies.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects' consistency with applicable land use plans from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Conflict with Adopted Conservation Plans.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or a less-than-significant impact on existing conservation plans. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this

facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create conflicts with applicable conservation plans for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to land use and planning could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the projects’ consistency with applicable adopted conservation plans and regulations from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to land use and planning that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documents found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts resulting from conflicts with adopted land use plans and zoning designations. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff’s independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, land use and planning impacts as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other “past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects.” [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal credit accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez), proposed SB 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill which would require transfer of

emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal credit accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827 or by obtaining offsets on the open market. Past development patterns within the district have resulted in a variety of different land use and planning changes, some of which have resulted in significant land use impacts. Development projects typically conform to existing land use and planning standards and zoning designations. Therefore, any future development within the district resulting from the project would have a low potential for resulting in cumulatively significant impacts related to land use and planning. Nevertheless, since the specific location of individual facilities cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative planning and land use impacts is even more uncertain. Some of the past projects were determined to have significant adverse impacts related to planning and land use, specifically due to the conflict with adopted land use plans and zoning designations.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The FSAs prepared by the CEC concluded that the El Segundo project would have no significant adverse land use and planning impacts and both Walnut Creek and Sentinel would be able to mitigate significant land use and planning impacts to less than significant. The FSA for the El Segundo project determined that the project is consistent with land use plans, ordinances, regulations and standards (LORS) and policies applicable to the project site and compatible with existing and planned land uses. Such regulations include the Federal Aviation, California Coastal Act, Warren-Alquist Act, California State Lands Commission Lease, State Subdivision Map Act, City of El Segundo General Plan, City of Los Angeles General Plan, and City of Manhattan Beach General Plan. Finally, the CEC concluded the El Segundo project is compatible with the heavy industrial character of the site and does not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

The Walnut Creek project complies with the LORS of the City of Industry where the project is located according to the FSA. The City of Industry would require a conditional use permit and zone exception for the project and the FSA has determined the Walnut Creek project will comply with these requirements from the City of Industry. The Walnut Creek project, the FSA states, is not located on federally administered lands or state land so is not subject to federal or state land use regulations. The FSA states that a project may have a significant impact on land use if it would create unmitigated noise,

dust, public health hazard or nuisance, traffic, or visual impacts, or when it precludes or unduly restricts existing or planned future uses. As noted in other parts of the FSA for the Walnut Creek projects, these other environmental impacts are mitigated to less than significant so impact to land use has been mitigated to less than significant. In addition, the CEC staff believes the proposed Walnut Creek project is consistent with the goals of the City of Industry General Plan and as conditioned, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project; disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community; contribute to a cumulative adverse effect on land use; or preclude or unduly restrict existing or planned future uses. One land use mitigation measure was proposed by the CEC to ensure the design and construction of the project follow the Development Plan Standards of the City of Industry's Development Guidelines.

The Sentinel project, according to the FSA, would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community and is consistent with the current development pattern for the area established by the Riverside County General Plan and Zoning Code, and the City of Palm Springs General Plan and Zoning Code with certain project components subject to Riverside County and the City of Palm Springs Public Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit. Further, the CEC determined that the Sentinel project would not be incompatible with existing on-site or nearby uses, as it is consistent with the general character of these permitted uses and the planned development pattern for the area. Finally, the CEC imposed a mitigation measure on the project to comply with the Subdivision Map Act by either adjusting the boundaries of all parcels or portions of parcels that constitute the Sentinel site (as necessary) to merge all properties into a single legal parcel, within the County of Riverside jurisdiction, in accordance with provisions and procedures set forth in the County of Riverside Ordinance 460 (Regulating the Division of Land of the County of Riverside), Section 18.7 (Merging of Contiguous Parcels), or by obtaining the County of Riverside's written approval that its proposal to record a lot-tie agreement is acceptable.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)), and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative land use and planning impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Land Use and Planning Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant land use and planning impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation

of potentially significant adverse land use and planning impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for land use and planning impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of land use and planning impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant land use and planning impact, the potential exists for future indirect land use and planning impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.11**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - MINERAL RESOURCES**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse impacts to mineral resources depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential impacts on mineral resources from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential impacts to mineral resources is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed project in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse indirect impacts to mineral resources include assessments of impacts related to the loss of mineral resources or the loss of mineral resource recovery sites.

Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant impacts to mineral resources if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.
- Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

## IMPACT ANALYSIS

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential indirect impacts to mineral resources from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential indirect impacts they may have on mineral resources of a given area. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of mineral resource impacts is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse indirect impacts to mineral resources. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in the loss of mineral resources. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories

#### Agricultural Facilities

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to mineral resources as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include the loss of mineral resources due to siting of future facilities. Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to areas known to contain important mineral resources. The potential scale and geographic distribution of farm structures, dairy processing plants, and other agricultural-related structures may result in significant impacts to mineral resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.11-1) which summarizes the

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

**TABLE 5.11-1**  
**Mineral Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |                                     |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>     |  |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                      |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |                                     |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b>   |  |
|   | <b>a) Loss of valuable resource</b> | <b>b) Loss of resource recovery site</b> |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>  |                                     |  |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR   | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                                      | NE                                  | NE                                       |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                       |                                     |  |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                               | N                                   | N  |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR   | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                          | N                                   | N  |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                                      | NE                                  | NE                                       |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                           | N                                   | N  |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                       | N                                   | N  |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                               | N                                   | N  |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR  | N                                   | N  |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                                      |                                     |  |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR  | NE                                  | NE                                       |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR  | N                                   | N  |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                        | N                                   | N  |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                                   | N                                   | N  |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                       | N                                   | N  |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                            |                                     |  |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR                  | LS                                  | LS                                       |

**TABLE 5.11-1 (Continued)**  
**Mineral Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|  |                                     |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>     |  |
| LS – Less-than-Significant   | N – No impacts                      |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                                      |                                     |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>          | <b>Significance Determination</b>   |  |
|  | <b>a) Loss of valuable resource</b> | <b>b) Loss of resource recovery site</b> |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR                               | N                                   | N  |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                                | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>  |                                     |  |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR   | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                                       | N                                   | N  |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                                     | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                                    | N                                   | N  |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR  | N                                   | N  |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR  | N                                   | N  |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR   | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                                    | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR                            | NE                                  | NE                                       |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.                                    | N                                   | N  |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | N                                   | N  |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR                               | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |                                     |  |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR                              | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR | N                                   | N  |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | N                                   | N  |

**TABLE 5.11-1 (Concluded)**  
**Mineral Resources Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |                                     |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>     |  |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                      |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |                                     |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>   | <b>Significance Determination</b>   |  |
|   | <b>a) Loss of valuable resource</b> | <b>b) Loss of resource recovery site</b> |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>   |                                     |  |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility  | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR  | N                                   | N  |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>  |                                     |  |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | LS                                  | N  |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | N                                   | N  |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |                                     |  |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LS                                  | LS                                       |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N                                   | N  |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |                                     |  |

determination of impacts on mineral resources in all the reviewed CEQA documents. The two selected CEQA documents<sup>2</sup>, which were prepared for a winery and a county

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on mineral resources. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities are typically constructed and operated within areas zoned for agriculture and were consistent with the existing land use of the surrounding area. Accordingly, these projects were found to have less-than-significant mineral resource impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on mineral resources identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

- a) **Loss of Mineral Resources.** One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less than significant impact related to the loss of mineral resources; the other CEQA document did not discuss loss of mineral resources impacts. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas known to contain mineral resources that could result in the loss of mineral resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less than significant impact related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts from the loss of mineral resources recovery site. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in an area designated as a recovery site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse impact.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery site resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new

construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential for affecting areas known to contain mineral resources or areas designated as mineral resource recovery sites. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts to mineral resources in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.11-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on mineral resources. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings. Project-specific impacts were not considered significant impacts as most retail and service establishments surveyed are located in developed urban areas and not areas designated as mineral resource recovery sites. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on mineral resources identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Loss of Mineral Resources.** Seven of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either less than significant or no impacts related to the loss of mineral resources; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts related such issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas known to contain mineral resources that could result in the loss of mineral resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** Seven of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either less than significant

or no impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts related such issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in area designated to as a recovery site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse impact.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery site resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting and be located in developed areas. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for being located in areas known to contain mineral resources or areas known to contain mining activities. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts to mineral resources. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.11-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on mineral resources. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas. Project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts since most of the commercial facilities are located in developed urban areas and not areas known to support mining operations or areas known to contain mineral resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on mineral resources identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Loss of Mineral Resources.** Eight of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed no impacts related to the loss of mineral resources; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts related to such issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas known to contain mineral resources that could result in the loss of mineral resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** Eight of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed no impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts related to such issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in area designated to as a recovery site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse impact.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery site resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Accordingly, based on these historical data, a small number of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities is anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to alter undeveloped open space and natural areas, areas that may contain mineral resources or mining activities. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more

future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse mineral resources impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.11-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on mineral resources. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, outdoor lighting, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities. Depending on location, these projects could impact areas known to contain mineral resources. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of impacts on mineral resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Loss of Mineral Resources.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas known to contain mineral resources that could result in the loss of mineral resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in area designated to as a recovery site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse impact.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore,

impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery site resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of areas known to contain mineral resources or mining activities. Accordingly, these future facilities would have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts to mineral resources. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse impacts on mineral resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 11.2-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on mineral resources. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities, which were found to result in less-than-significant impacts to mineral resources. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on mineral resources identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Loss of Mineral Resources.** 14 of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resources; the other CEQA document did not address loss of mineral resources impacts. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas known to contain mineral resources that could result in the loss of mineral resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time

the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** 14 of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to such issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in area designated to as a recovery site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse impact.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery site resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data, as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting. However, any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for significantly impacting areas known to contain mineral resources. Therefore, transportation facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant mineral resources impacts according to the CEQA documents reviewed. However, the potential exists for one or more future transportation-related projects to have significant impacts on mineral resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.11-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on mineral resources. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, bus storage and maintenance facilities, and mixed-use residential and commercial facilities, some of which were found to result in changes to areas known to contain mineral resources. However, the CEQA documents for the projects that were surveyed were found to have less-than-significant mineral resource impacts as most of these projects were located in developed mixed-use, industrial, and commercial zoned areas. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on mineral resources identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Loss of Mineral Resources.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas known to contain mineral resources that could result in the loss of mineral resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in area designated to as a recovery site, resulting in potentially significant adverse impact.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery site resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Although these facilities would typically be constructed in industrial zoned areas, these facilities may be sited near or directly adjacent to areas known to contain mineral resources or areas that support mining activities. Therefore, future construction and operation of utility facilities could generate significant adverse mineral resources impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.11-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on mineral resources. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, could generate changes to areas that support mining activities. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on mineral resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Loss of Mineral Resources.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas known to contain mineral resources that could result in the loss of mineral resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore,

impacts related to the loss of mineral resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in area designated to as a recovery site, resulting in an adverse impact.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery site resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings that could result in significant adverse impacts to mineral resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.11-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on mineral resources. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in changes to areas known to support mining activities or areas that contain mineral resources. However, adverse effects were not found to be significant since most of these facilities were located in developed urban industrial areas. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of mineral impacts on mineral resources identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Loss of Mineral Resources.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial warehouse facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas known to contain mineral resources that could result in the loss of mineral resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial warehouse facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in area designated to as a recovery site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse impact.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery site resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. These facilities typically are located in industrial areas. Accordingly, though it is unlikely that these types of project, based on the surveyed CEQA documents, would significantly impact designated mineral resource recovery site

areas, future heavy industrial facilities have the potential of generating significant adverse impacts to mineral resources.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.11-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on mineral resources. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could generate changes in areas that contain mineral resources or designated recovery site areas. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on mineral resources identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Loss of Mineral Resources.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resources. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas known to contain mineral resources that could result in the loss of mineral resources.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resources resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery sites. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in area designated to as a recovery site, resulting in a significant adverse impact.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to mineral resources could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resource recovery site resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

## **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to mineral resources that were either less-than-significant or no impacts. However, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the CEQA documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts to mineral resources as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects." [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez), proposed SB 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal offset accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315 or SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. None of the 52 projects surveyed were found to contribute to the cumulative loss of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or contribute to the cumulative loss of availability of locally-important mineral resource recovery sites delineated on local general plans, specific plans or other land use plans. However, any future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts that would result in the loss of known mineral resources or the availability of locally-important mineral resource recovery sites would add to this cumulative reduction in the amount of mineral resources available within the district. Since the specific location of individual facilities cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative impacts on mineral resources is even more uncertain.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects were determined to have no significant adverse mineral resource impacts according to their respective FSAs. The potential significant impact to mineral resources from the Sentinel project, according to the FSA, could be mitigated to less than significant. For example, the CEC determined for the El Segundo project that the project location is designated as Mineral Resources Zone-3, an area of undetermined mineral resources potential and no mineral resources are known to have been identified at the present site and there are no significant sand or gravel mines in the area. Therefore, the CEC concluded no significant adverse mineral resources impacts will result from the El Segundo project. Similarly, the Walnut Creek project, according to the FSA, there are no known viable mineral resources on the property and no significant mineral deposits (aggregates) present, although mineralogical resources (sand, gravel, oil and gas) do exist in the vicinity of the project, such as the Walnut oil field approximately one mile to the east-northeast. So, it was CEC staff's opinion that the potential for significant adverse impacts to the project from mineral resources from the construction, operation, and closure of the proposed project, is low. However, in order to ensure the impacts remain low and less than significant, the project is subject to the following mitigation measure: adopting a compliance monitoring program that will ensure compliance with the laws, ordinances and regulations applicable to mineral resources.

The entire Sentinel site is mapped as Mineral Resource Zone 3, which refers to "areas containing mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data." The CEC determined that the Sentinel project has no known viable mineralogical resources within three miles of the site and no productive oil or gas fields will be affected by project development, therefore, the potential for significant adverse impacts to the project from mineral resources from the construction, operation, and closure of the proposed project, is low. Similar to the Walnut Creek, the Sentinel project imposes monitoring and mitigation measures for mineral resources to ensure compliance with applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) to mitigate potential mineral resources impacts to less than significant.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative mineral resources impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Mineral Resources Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant mineral resources impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse mineral resources impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for mineral resources impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of mineral resources impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant mineral resources impact, the potential exists for future indirect mineral resources impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.12**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES - NOISE**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse noise impacts depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project on noise from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential noise impacts is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed projects in place. The following analyses address the potential noise impacts that could result from the construction and operation of a project within a primary facility category in the district. Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant noise impacts if their implementation would result in either one of the following:

- Construction noise levels would exceed local noise ordinances or, if the noise threshold is currently exceeded, project noise sources would increase ambient noise levels by more than three decibels (dBA) at the site boundary. Construction noise levels would be considered significant if they would exceed federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) noise standards for workers.
- The proposed project operational noise levels would exceed any of the local noise ordinances at the site boundary or, if the noise threshold is currently exceeded, project noise sources would increase ambient noise levels by more than three dBA at the site boundary.

- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise level above levels existing without the project.
- A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels existing without the project.
- Exposure of persons to noise near public airport.
- Exposure of persons to noise near private airstrip.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential noise impacts from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on the noise environment. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of noise impacts is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse impacts on the noise environment. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in development adjacent to noise-sensitive receptors. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse noise impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

On a programmatic level, noise impacts as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include impacts related to the generation of noise levels in excess of established noise standards or thresholds, the generation of groundborne vibration, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and potential impacts related to noise exposure near airports or private airstrips. Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to noise-sensitive receptors, such as residential uses and schools. Activities related to the operation of agricultural facilities may result in significant noise impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.12-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on noise, including potential adverse effects related to generation of noise in excess of established standards, generation of groundborne noise or vibrations, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and exposure to excessive noise near airports or private airstrips. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities may result in noise impacts, specifically increased ambient noise during construction activities due to various excavating, grading, and construction equipment. Such increases would exceed established local standards on acceptable noise within the vicinity of noise-sensitive land uses. However, these projects were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on noise. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of noise impacts identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a) Violation of Applicable Noise Standards.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the violation of established noise standards. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts by exposing people to noise levels in excess of established noise standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.12-1  
Noise Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |                            | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                    |  |                                       |                                   |  |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       |                            | N – No impacts                                     |  |                                       |                                   |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |                            |  |  |                                       |                                   |  |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination |  |  |                                       |                                   |  |
|  | a) Noise Exceeds Standards | b) Exposure to Excessive Noise or Ground Vibration | c) Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise | d) Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise | e) Exposure to Noise near Airport | f) Exposure to Noise in Private Airstrip |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>                                   |                            |  |  |                                       |                                   |  |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR                                    | LSM                        | LS   | LS                                     | LSM                                   | N                                 | N  |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                               | LS                         | LS   | LS                                     | LS                                    | LS                                | LS                                       |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                |                            |  |  |                                       |                                   |  |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                        | LSM                        | LSM  | LS                                     | LS                                    | N                                 | N  |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR                                  | LS                         | LS   | LS                                     | S                                     | NE                                | NE                                       |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                   | LSM                        | LS   | S                                      | LSM                                   | N                                 | N  |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                               | LSM                        | LS   | LS                                     | LSM                                   | NE                                | NE                                       |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed-use Development EIR                    | LS                         | LSM  | LS                                     | LSM                                   | LS                                | LS                                       |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                | LS                         | LS   | LS                                     | LS                                    | LS                                | LS                                       |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                        | LS                         | LS   | LS                                     | LSM                                   | N                                 | N  |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | LS                         | LS   | LS                                     | LSM                                   | NE                                | NE                                       |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                               |                            |  |  |                                       |                                   |  |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel  | LSM                        | LS   | LS                                     | LSM                                   | N                                 | N  |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR                                     | LS                         | LS   | LS                                     | S                                     | NE                                | LS                                       |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR                                 | LS                         | LS   | LS                                     | LSM                                   | N                                 | N  |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                 | LS                         | NE   | LS                                     | LS                                    | NE                                | NE                                       |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | S                          | LS   | LS                                     | S                                     | NE                                | NE                                       |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR                                  | LS                         | S  | S                                      | S                                     | N                                 | N  |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR                                  | LS                         | LSM  | LS                                     | S                                     | LS                                | LS                                       |

**TABLE 5.12-1 (Continued)**  
**Noise Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| S – Significant   |                                   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                           |   |  |  |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |                                   | N – No impacts  |   |  |  |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b> |   |   |  |  |   |
|   | <b>a) Noise Exceeds Standards</b> | <b>b) Exposure to Excessive Noise or Ground Vibration</b> | <b>c) Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise</b> | <b>d) Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise</b> | <b>e) Exposure to Noise near Airport</b> | <b>f) Exposure to Noise in Private Airstrip</b> |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                                   | LSM                               | LS  | LS  | LSM  | NE                                       | NE  |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                       | S                                 | S   | S   | S  | LS                                       | LS  |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                            |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
| 20. City of Industry Business Ctr. (NFL Stadium) EIR                    | S                                 | LS  | S   | S  | N  | N   |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR                      | LSM                               | LS  | S   | S  | N  | N   |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR  | LSM                               | NE  | LS  | S  | NE                                       | NE  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                       | LS                                | LS  | LS  | S  | LS                                       | N   |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>   |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR                                | LS                                | LS  | LS  | N  | N  | N   |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                              | LS                                | LS  | LS  | S  | NE                                       | NE  |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                            | LS                                | LS  | LS  | S  | LS                                       | LS  |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                           | LS                                | S   | LS  | S  | N  | N   |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR                                     | LS                                | S   | LS  | S  | N  | N   |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR                                     | N                                 | LSM   | LSM   | S  | N  | N   |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR                                | LSM                               | LS  | LS  | LS   | NE                                       | NE  |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                           | LS                                | LS  | LS  | S  | N  | N   |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR                                      | LS                                | LSM   | S   | S  | N  | N   |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR                                      | S                                 | LS  | S   | S  | N  | N   |
| 34. Sierra Cyn. Senior Secondary School Project EIR                     | LSM                               | NE  | LSM   | LSM  | NE                                       | NE  |
| 35. West LA College EIR   | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LSM  | N  | N   |

**TABLE 5.12-1 (Continued)**  
**Noise Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|  |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| S – Significant  |                                   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                           |   |  |  |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant   |                                   | N – No impacts  |   |  |  |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>                      | <b>Significance Determination</b> |   |   |  |  |   |
|  | <b>a) Noise Exceeds Standards</b> | <b>b) Exposure to Excessive Noise or Ground Vibration</b> | <b>c) Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise</b> | <b>d) Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise</b> | <b>e) Exposure to Noise near Airport</b> | <b>f) Exposure to Noise in Private Airstrip</b> |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.  | LSM                               | LS  | LS  | LS   | N  | N   |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | LS                                | LS  | S   | S  | NE                                       | NE  |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LS   | N  | N   |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | LS                                | NE  | LS  | S  | NE                                       | NE  |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LS   | N  | N   |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LS                                | LS  | LSM   | LSM  | NE                                       | NE  |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>  |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | LSM                               | LS  | LSM   | LSM  | LS                                       | LS  |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LSM  | N  | N   |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR  | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LSM  | N  | N   |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR                      | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LS   | N  | N   |
| <b>Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities</b>   |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR   | LS                                | N   | LS  | LS   | N  | N   |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR   | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LS   | LS                                       | LS  |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Dev. Project EIR  | LSM                               | LS  | LS  | LS   | NE                                       | NE  |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR  | LS                                | LS  | LS  | S  | N  | N   |

**TABLE 5.12-1 (Concluded)**  
**Noise Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| S – Significant   |                                   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>                           |   |  |  |   |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |                                   | N – No impacts  |   |  |  |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>   | <b>Significance Determination</b> |   |   |  |  |   |
|   | <b>a) Noise Exceeds Standards</b> | <b>b) Exposure to Excessive Noise or Ground Vibration</b> | <b>c) Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise</b> | <b>d) Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise</b> | <b>e) Exposure to Noise near Airport</b> | <b>f) Exposure to Noise in Private Airstrip</b> |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LS   | N  | N   |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LSM  | LS                                       | LS  |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | LS                                | LS  | LS  | LS   | N  | N   |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |                                   |   |   |  |  |   |

to noise levels in excess of established noise standards from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant

- b) Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise or Groundborne Vibration.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact related to excessive groundborne noise or vibration. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is sensitive to groundborne vibrations or already exposed to groundborne vibrations, which could exacerbate these conditions or create significant adverse impacts to persons residing in and around an particular area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from groundborne noise or vibration from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d) Permanent or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on ambient noise levels. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create either temporary or permanent increases in the ambient noise beyond generally acceptable levels.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing ambient noise levels from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Exposure of Persons to Noise Near a Public Airport or Private Airstrip.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed either no impact or a less-than-significant impact related to noise exposure near airports or private airstrips. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near an area already experiencing exposure to noise from a nearby airport or private airstrip, which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts related to noise.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to noise from nearby airports or private airstrips from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, noise impacts as a result of constructing future new retail facilities may include impacts related to the generation of noise levels in excess of established noise standards or thresholds, the generation of groundborne vibration, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and potential impacts related to noise exposure within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip. In addition, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas, where a potential to create new noise impacts on existing sensitive receptors exists. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse noise impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail/service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.12-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on noise, including potential adverse effects related to construction noise in excess of established noise standards, as well as temporary increases to ambient noise levels due to various types of noise-producing construction equipment. Based on a review of these documents, retail/service facilities may result in the temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise due to the operation of on-site facilities (e.g., noise associated with loading docks and delivery vehicles) or permanent increases in ambient noise due to the corresponding increases in traffic in an area. Most of these projects were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on noise. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of noise impacts identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

- a) Violation of Applicable Noise Standards.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the violation of established noise standards. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts by exposing people to noise levels in excess of established noise standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to noise levels in excess of established noise standards from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise or Groundborne Vibration.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to excessive groundborne noise or vibration. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is sensitive to groundborne vibrations or already exposed to groundborne vibrations, which could exacerbate these conditions or create significant adverse impacts to persons residing in and around an particular area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from groundborne noise or vibration from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d) Permanent or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts on the ambient noise levels were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for some projects surveyed, the lead agencies concluded that the retail/service facility projects have the potential to generate significant adverse permanent or periodic increases in ambient noise levels, such as those disclosed for Project #4 (Wilshire La Brea Project) and Project #5 (Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan Project), which were found to have a potential to increase ambient noise due to the addition of vehicular traffic during operations and due to the use of noise-producing on-site activities, such as the loading docks. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have

obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create either temporary or permanent significant adverse impacts on the ambient noise beyond generally acceptable levels.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on the existing ambient noise levels from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Exposure of Persons to Noise Near a Public Airport or Private Airstrip.** Five of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant noise impacts related to airports or private airstrips; the other three CEQA documents did not address noise impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near an area already experiencing exposure to noise from a nearby airport or private airstrip, which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts related to noise.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to noise from nearby airports or private airstrips from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings and parking structures/lots. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial project to generate significant adverse noise impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.12-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on noise, including potential adverse effects related to generation of noise in excess of established standards, generation of groundborne noise or vibrations, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and exposure to excessive noise near airports or private airstrips. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found to potentially result increased ambient noise during construction and demolition activities that would exceed established local standards on acceptable noise levels, operational traffic noise that would produce permanent increases to ambient noise levels in excess of established standards, or construction activities that would produce groundborne noise and vibrations in excess of acceptable vibration levels. However, most project-specific impacts were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on noise. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of noise impacts identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Violation of Applicable Noise Standards.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts on the ambient noise levels were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for some projects, the lead agencies concluded that large commercial projects have the potential to generate significant adverse noise impacts, such as those disclosed for the Project #15 (Boulevard 6200 Project) and Project #19 (Plaza at the Glen Project), which were found to have a potential to expose people to noise levels in excess of established standards due to construction noise generated by these projects. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts by exposing people to noise levels in excess of established noise standards.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to noise levels in excess of established noise standards from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise or Groundborne Vibration.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts pertaining to groundborne noise and vibration were concluded to be less-than-significant. However, for some

projects, the lead agencies concluded that the large commercial projects have the potential to generate significant adverse groundborne noise and vibration impacts, such as those disclosed for the Project #16 (Panorama Palace Project) and Project #19 (Plaza at the Glen Project), which were both found to have a potential to expose people to excessive groundborne noise or vibration levels during construction activities, particularly during activities such as pile driving. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is sensitive to groundborne vibrations or already exposed to groundborne vibrations, which could exacerbate these conditions or create significant adverse impacts to persons residing in and around an particular area.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore impacts from groundborne noise or vibration from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d) Permanent or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts pertaining to the temporary, periodic, or permanent increases in ambient noise levels were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for some projects, the lead agencies concluded that the large commercial projects have the potential to generate significant increases in the ambient noise levels, such as those disclosed for the Projects #12 (2000 Avenue of the Stars), #15 (Boulevard 6100), #16 (Panorama Palace), #17 (Metro Universal), and #19 (Plaza at the Glen), which were found to have a potential to permanently increase ambient noise levels due to increased vehicular traffic during project operations and on-site activities, such as loading dock operation, and to periodically increase ambient noise levels due to construction-related noise. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create either temporary or permanent significant adverse impacts on the ambient noise beyond generally acceptable levels.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing

ambient noise levels from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Exposure of Persons to Noise Near a Public Airport or Private Airstrip.** Five of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact on noise related to airports or private airstrips. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near an area already experiencing exposure to noise from a nearby airport or private airstrip, which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts related to noise.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to noise from nearby airports or private airstrips from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Accordingly, based on these historical data, a small number of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities are anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to alter undeveloped open space and natural areas that may result in changes to the existing noise conditions or lead to new sources of ambient noise. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse noise impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.12-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on noise, including potential adverse effects related to generation of noise in excess of established standards,

generation of groundborne noise or vibrations, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and exposure to excessive noise near airports or private airstrips. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, parking lots, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were found to result in both periodic and permanent increases in ambient noise levels due to construction-related noise, event-related traffic noise, noise from the operation of stationary sources, and noise from vehicular traffic, some of which were in excess of established applicable noise standards. Based on a review of these documents, entertainment/recreational-related facilities may result in noise impacts, including the periodic increases in ambient noise during construction activities due to various excavating, grading, and construction equipment; periodic increases in ambient noise during special events resulting from increases in traffic and some event-related equipment or vehicles, such as helicopters; or permanent increases in ambient noise during facility operation resulting from noise-producing activities, such as loading dock operations. Such increases in ambient noise levels would exceed standards related to sensitive land uses, such as residences and recreational facilities (e.g., parks). More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of noise impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Violation of Applicable Noise Standards.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts on the ambient noise levels were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for one of the projects, the lead agency concluded that an entertainment/recreational facility category project has the potential to result in significant adverse noise impacts, such as those disclosed for the Project #20 (City of Industry Business Center - NFL Stadium), which was found to have a potential to expose people to noise levels in excess of established standards due to traffic noise generated by the events during the operation of the project. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts by exposing people to noise levels in excess of established noise standards.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to noise levels in excess of established noise standards from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise or Groundborne Vibration.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to groundborne noise or vibration; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to groundborne noise or vibration. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of

similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is sensitive to groundborne vibrations or already exposed to groundborne vibrations, which could exacerbate these conditions or create significant adverse impacts to persons residing in and around an particular area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from groundborne noise or vibration from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d) Permanent or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that all of these projects would have significant impacts on the existing ambient noise levels. For each of the four projects surveyed, the lead agencies concluded that the entertainment/recreation projects have the potential to result in a significant permanent, periodic, or permanent and periodic increase in ambient noise levels due to construction related noise; operational stationary source noise, such as parking structures or helicopters; and increased traffic noise during operation and special events, such as professional sports games. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create either temporary or permanent significant adverse impacts on the ambient noise beyond generally acceptable levels.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on the existing ambient noise level from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Exposure of Persons to Noise Near a Public Airport or Private Airstrip.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no noise impacts related to airports or private airstrips; the other CEQA document did not address noise impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near an area already experiencing exposure to noise from a nearby airport or private airstrip, which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts related to noise.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to noise from nearby airports or private airstrips from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and parking lots. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential to measurably increase the existing noise levels. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to have significant adverse noise impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.12-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on noise, including potential adverse effects related to generation of noise in excess of established standards, generation of groundborne noise or vibrations, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and exposure to excessive noise near airports or private airstrips. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities. Based on review of these documents, institutional facilities may result in noise impacts, including both permanent and periodic increases in ambient noise levels during construction and demolition activities, some of which were found to be in excess of established standards regarding acceptable noise levels, or the generation of groundborne vibrations related to construction and demolition activities. However, most project-specific impacts were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on noise. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of noise impacts identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Violation of Applicable Noise Standards.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts on the ambient noise levels were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation or no impact related to violation of established noise standards. However, for one of the projects (Project # 33 – USC Health Sciences Campus), the lead agency concluded that this institutional project had the potential to result in a significant adverse noise impact due to the exposure of people to noise levels in excess of established standards during project construction. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts by exposing people or incompatible land uses to noise levels in excess of established noise standards.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to noise levels in excess of established noise standards from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise or Groundborne Vibration.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts pertaining to groundborne noise and vibration were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for some projects, the lead agencies concluded that large commercial projects have the potential to result in significant adverse noise impacts, such as those disclosed for the Projects #27 (La Cienega Eldercare Facility) and #28 (Museum of Tolerance), which were found to have a potential to expose people to excessive groundborne noise or vibration levels due to construction activities, such as pile driving. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is sensitive to groundborne vibrations or already exposed to groundborne vibrations, which could exacerbate these conditions or create significant adverse impacts to persons residing in and around an particular area.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts from groundborne noise or vibration from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d) Permanent or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts pertaining to the temporary, periodic, or

permanent increases in ambient noise levels were concluded to be less than significant (without or with mitigation). However, for the other projects, the lead agencies concluded that large commercial projects have the potential to result in significant permanent and/or periodic increases in ambient noise levels, such as those disclosed for Projects #25 (Buckley School Enhancement), #26 (Cedars Sinai West Tower), #27 (La Cienega Eldercare Facility), #28 (Museum of Tolerance), #29 (New Paradise Church), #31 (Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation), #32 (Temple Israel of Hollywood), #33 (USC Health Sciences Campus), and #37 (Harvard-Westlake School). These projects were found to have a potential to permanently increase ambient noise due to increased vehicular traffic during operations; permanently increase ambient noise due to noise from a proposed land use, such as a children's playground; and periodically increase ambient noise due to construction-related activities. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create either temporary or permanent significant adverse impacts on the ambient noise beyond generally acceptable levels.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on the existing ambient noise levels from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Exposure of Persons to Noise Near a Public Airport or Private Airstrip.** 11 of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact on noise related to airports or private airstrips; the other four CEQA documents did not address noise impacts related to airports or private airstrips. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near an area already experiencing exposure to noise from a nearby airport or private airstrip, which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts related to noise.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to noise from nearby airports or private airstrips from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to

continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities). Any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential to create noise impacts near sensitive receptors or incompatible land uses. However, the potential exists for one or more future transportation-related projects to have significant adverse noise impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.12-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on noise, including potential adverse effects related to generation of noise in excess of established standards, generation of groundborne noise or vibrations, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and exposure to excessive noise near airports or private airstrips. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, and bus storage and maintenance facilities. Based on a review of these documents, transportation-related facilities may result in noise impacts due to periodic construction-related increases in the ambient noise levels. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of noise impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Violation of Applicable Noise Standards.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to violation of established noise standards. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts by exposing people to noise levels in excess of established noise standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to noise levels in excess of established noise standards from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise or Groundborne Vibration.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to groundborne noise or vibration; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to such issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is sensitive to groundborne vibrations or already exposed to groundborne vibrations, which could exacerbate these conditions or create significant adverse impacts to persons residing in and around an particular area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from groundborne noise or vibration from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d) Permanent or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts pertaining to the temporary, periodic, or permanent increases in ambient noise levels were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for one of the projects (Project #39 – TraPac Terminal Expansion), the lead agency concluded that this transportation project had the potential to result in significant periodic increases in ambient noise levels due to construction activities in several locations near sensitive receptors. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create periodic significant adverse impacts on the ambient noise beyond a generally acceptable level.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on the existing ambient noise levels from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Exposure of Persons to Noise Near a Public Airport or Private Airstrip.** One of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed no impact related to airports or private airstrips; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to such issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near an area already experiencing exposure to noise from a nearby airport or private airstrip, which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts related to noise.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to noise from nearby airports or private airstrips from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities are not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Any new utility project would most likely be constructed within an already developed area and would, therefore, have a low potential to create new sources of ambient noise or alter the existing noise conditions of an area. However, the potential exists for one or more future utility projects to have significant adverse noise impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.12-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on noise, including potential adverse effects related to generation of noise in excess of established standards, generation of groundborne noise or vibrations, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and exposure to excessive noise near

airports or private airstrips. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, may result in the periodic increases in ambient noise levels due to construction and demolition activities, permanent increases in ambient noise levels due to increased traffic noise and operation of noise-producing stationary equipment, and noise levels in excess of established applicable noise standards. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of noise impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Violation of Applicable Noise Standards.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to violation of established noise standards. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts by exposing people to noise levels in excess of established noise standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to noise levels in excess of established noise standards from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise or Groundborne Vibration.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to groundborne noise or vibration. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is sensitive to groundborne vibrations or already exposed to groundborne vibrations, which could exacerbate these conditions or create significant adverse impacts to persons residing in and around an particular area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from groundborne noise or vibration from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d) Permanent or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed less-

than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on the existing ambient noise levels of an area. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create either temporary or permanent significant adverse impacts on the ambient noise beyond generally acceptable levels.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on the existing ambient noise level from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e, f) Exposure of Persons to Noise Near a Public Airport or Private Airstrip.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no noise impacts related to airports or private airstrips. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near an area already experiencing exposure to noise from a nearby airport or private airstrip, which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts related to noise.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to noise from nearby airports or private airstrips from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings. Any new light industrial/warehouse facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial and commercial-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential to

measurably change the existing noise conditions or lead to new sources of ambient noise. However, the potential exists for one or more future light industrial projects to have significant adverse noise impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.12-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on noise, including potential adverse effects related to generation of noise in excess of established standards, generation of groundborne noise or vibrations, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and exposure to excessive noise near airports or private airstrips. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in noise impacts, including the periodic increases in ambient noise levels due to construction and demolition activities, permanent increases in ambient noise levels due to increased traffic noise and operation of stationary noise producing equipment, and noise levels in excess of established applicable noise standards. However, most project-specific impacts were found to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on noise. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of noise impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Violation of Applicable Noise Standards.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to violation of established noise standards. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts by exposing people to noise levels in excess of established noise standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to noise levels in excess of established noise standards from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise or Groundborne Vibration.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact on groundborne noise or vibration. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location

that is sensitive to groundborne vibrations or already exposed to groundborne vibrations, which could exacerbate these conditions or create significant adverse impacts to persons residing in and around an particular area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from groundborne noise or vibration from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d) Permanent or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts pertaining to the temporary, periodic, or permanent increases in ambient noise levels were concluded to be less-than-significant. However, for one of the projects (Project #49 – 959 Seward Street), the lead agency concluded that this light industrial/warehouse project had the potential to result in significant impacts from periodic increases in ambient noise levels due to construction period noise. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create periodic adverse impacts on the ambient noise beyond generally acceptable levels.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on the existing ambient noise levels from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Exposure of Persons to Noise Near a Public Airport or Private Airstrip.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts related to noise caused by airports or private airstrips; the other CEQA document did not discuss noise impacts related to airports or private airstrips. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near an area already experiencing exposure to noise from a nearby airport or private airstrip, which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts related to noise.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related

to exposure of persons to noise from nearby airports or private airstrips from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. Any new heavy industrial facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial and commercial-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for measurably changing the existing noise conditions or lead to new sources of ambient noise. However, the potential exists for one or more future heavy industrial projects to have significant adverse noise impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.12-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on noise, including potential adverse effects related to generation of noise in excess of established standards, generation of groundborne noise or vibrations, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and exposure to excessive noise near airports or private airstrips. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could generate noise impacts, including the periodic increases in ambient noise levels due to construction and demolition activities, permanent increases in ambient noise levels due to increased traffic noise and operation of stationary noise producing equipment, or noise levels in excess of established applicable noise standards. However, project-specific impacts were found in the CEQA document surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on noise. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of noise impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Violation of Applicable Noise Standards.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to compliance with applicable noise standards. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this

facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create significant adverse impacts by exposing people or incompatible land uses to noise levels in excess of established noise standards.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to noise levels in excess of established noise standards from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise or Groundborne Vibration.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on groundborne noise or vibration. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that is sensitive to groundborne vibrations or already exposed to groundborne vibrations, which could exacerbate these conditions or create significant adverse impacts to persons residing in and around an particular area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from groundborne noise or vibration from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c, d) Permanent or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on the existing ambient noise levels. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that could create either periodic or permanent significant adverse impacts on the ambient noise beyond generally acceptable levels.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on existing ambient noise levels from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**e, f) Exposure of Persons to Noise Near a Public Airport or Private Airstrip.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts on noise related to airports or private airstrips. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near an area already experiencing exposure to noise from a nearby airport or private airstrip, which could exacerbate existing conditions and create significant adverse impacts related to noise.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, noise impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to noise from nearby airports or private airstrips from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to noise that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documents found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse noise impacts, including potential adverse effects related to the violation of applicable noise level standards, generation of groundborne noise or vibration, and periodic or permanent increases in ambient noise levels. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, noise impacts as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects." [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez), proposed SB 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill, which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal offset accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. Development within a project area could cumulatively affect noise by creating additional sources of ambient noise or through siting of noise-producing land uses immediately adjacent to sensitive receptors. Since some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse noise impacts, including potential adverse effects related to the generation of noise levels in excess of established noise standards or thresholds, the generation of groundborne vibration, permanent increases in ambient noise levels, temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels, and potential impacts related to noise exposure near airports or private airstrips, cumulative impacts resulting from any future projects to be constructed within the district are determined to be potentially considerable.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

Potentially significant adverse noise impacts from the construction and operation of the three power plants were determined by the CEC to be significant but could be mitigated to less than significant. As written in the FSA for the El Segundo project, the construction and operation of any power plant creates noise or unwanted sound, and the character and loudness of this noise, the times of day or night that it is produced, and the proximity of the facility to sensitive receptors determine whether the facility would meet applicable noise control laws and ordinances, and whether it would cause significant adverse noise impacts. The FSA continues to state that vibration may be produced as a result of power plant operation or of construction practices, such as pile driving, and that ground-borne energy of vibration has the potential to cause structural damage and annoyance.

Specifically, the El Segundo FSA determined that the project will generate noise from the construction and demolition louder than permissible under local noise ordinances, so noise mitigation measures are recommended to monitor and mitigate potential construction and demolition noise impacts. These mitigation measures include notifying all residents, property owners, and business owners within one-half mile of the site, and the City of Manhattan Beach, the City of El Segundo, and L.A. County Lifeguard Headquarters of the commencement of project construction; documenting, investigating, evaluating, and attempting to resolve all project-related noise complaints; establishing a “hotline” for noise complaints; designating a noise monitoring officer; taking all feasible measures to reduce the noise at its source as soon as possible; requiring haul trucks and other engine-powered equipment to be equipped with adequate mufflers; operating haul trucks in accordance with posted speed limits; and limiting truck engine exhaust brake use to emergencies. The implementation of these mitigation measures during construction, the CEC concluded, will reduce the significant adverse noise impacts to less than significant. The operation of the El Segundo project, according to the FSA, will result in a steady, continuous noise source day and night from the operation of the steam turbine generator, gas turbine generators, heat recovery steam generators, transformers, boiler feed pumps, circulating water pumps, fin fan coolers, and gas compressors. Occasional short-term increases in noise levels would occur as steam relief valves open to vent pressure, or during startup or shutdown as the plant transitions to and from steady-state operation. The FSA determined that at other times, such as when the plant is shut down for lack of dispatch or for maintenance, noise levels would decrease. Operational noise mitigation measures include the following: enclosure around the gas turbine compartments; noise barriers around the gas turbine generators, boilers, and transformers; acoustic shroud around the gas turbine exhaust ducts and transition ductwork; silencers at the boiler exit stack; enclosures around the steam turbine package and the generator package; enclosures for major pumps; and noise barriers for fin fan coolers. In addition, the CEC requires the project design and implementation to include appropriate noise mitigation measures adequate to ensure that the project will not cause resultant noise levels to exceed the ambient median noise level ( $L_{50}$ ) at residential receivers by two decibels or more, so that the noise due to plant operations will comply with the noise standards of the El Segundo and Manhattan Beach Municipal Codes and the operation of the El Segundo project will not produce significant adverse noise impacts.

The construction activities at the Walnut Creek project will be temporary and will occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., which would be in compliance with the applicable noise laws, ordinances, regulations and standards (LORS). In the event that actual construction noise should annoy nearby workers or residents, CEC staff proposes conditions which would establish a Noise Complaint Process that requires the project proponent to resolve any problems caused by construction noise. Further, the CEC determined that the adverse noise impacts from construction activities would be mitigated by notifying all residents within one-half mile of the site and the linear facilities of the commencement of project construction; documenting, investigating, evaluating, and attempting to resolve all project-related noise complaints; limiting hours of operation of heavy construction equipment; requiring haul trucks and other engine-powered equipment to be equipped with adequate mufflers; operating haul trucks in accordance with posted speed limits; and limiting truck engine exhaust brake use to emergencies.

The only construction activity likely to produce vibration that could be perceived offsite would be pile driving, however, because vibration studies concluded pile driving would be less than the vibration threshold to induce structural damage, CEC staff believes pile driving would not result in significant vibration impacts at the nearby commercial buildings or the nearest sensitive receptors. The primary noise sources from the operation of the Walnut Creek project would include the gas turbine generators, gas turbine air inlets, exhaust stacks, wet cooling tower, natural gas fuel compressor, electrical transformers, and various pumps and fans. The FSA listed the following noise mitigation measures: additional noise barriers around gas turbine enclosures; inlet air filter/ventilation silencing; increased stack silencing; increased thickness of the selective catalytic reduction (SCR) plate steel; additional noise barriers around SCR inlet and expansion joint; low noise, slow speed cooling tower fans and motors; cooling tower noise barriers and/or splash noise attenuators; additional cooling tower noise barriers; and silencers and/or enclosures on auxiliary equipment. Additional mitigation found in the FSA to ensure the adverse operational noise impacts are less than significant include: designing and implementing the project to include appropriate noise mitigation measures adequate to ensure that operation of the project will not cause noise levels attributable to plant operation, during the four quietest consecutive hours of the nighttime, to exceed an average of 52 decibels (dBA); and conduct an occupational noise survey to identify the noise hazardous areas in the facility. According to the FSA, the City of Industry General Plan contains noise goals, standards, and policy statements to encourage compatibility with surrounding communities and to maintain a low profile of noise sources in the surrounding communities. CEC staff concludes that the Walnut Creek project operational noise will create less than significant adverse impacts at the most sensitive receptors and will thus comply with the applicable local noise LORS.

For the Sentinel project, CEC staff concludes that the project can be built and operated in compliance with all applicable noise and vibration LORS and, if built in accordance with the mitigation measures proposed, would produce no significant adverse noise impacts on sensitive receptors, either direct or indirect. Adverse noise impacts would result from the operation of construction equipment (e.g., bulldozers, haul trucks) and operational plant equipment (e.g., turbines, pumps). Operational noise mitigation measures in the Sentinel FSA included locating natural gas compressors in two sound-attenuated buildings; installing silencers on the gas turbine exhaust stack; and evacuating and/or removing the two residences nearest the project site. The FSA for the Sentinel project listed the following mitigation measures to mitigate significant noise impacts from both construction and operation to less than significant: notify all residents within three-quarter mile of the site of the commencement of project construction; establish a telephone number for use by the public to report any undesirable noise conditions associated with the construction and operation of the project; documenting, investigating, evaluating, and attempting to resolve all project-related noise complaints; approve a noise control program and implement; design and implement the project to include appropriate noise mitigation measures adequate to ensure that operation of the project will not cause noise levels due solely to plant operation to exceed an average of 48 dBA Leq; conduct an occupational noise survey to identify the noise hazardous areas in the facility; restrict noisy construction work relating to any project features to specific times of day; requiring haul trucks and other engine-powered equipment to be equipped with adequate

mufflers; operating haul trucks in accordance with posted speed limits; and limiting truck engine exhaust brake use to emergencies.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative noise impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Noise Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant noise impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse noise impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for noise impacts in this EA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. As a result, those measures identified in the survey of CEQA documents to mitigate noise impacts are not listed in this Program PEA. Identification and adoption of mitigation of noise impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant noise impact, the potential exists for future indirect noise impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.13**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES – POPULATION AND HOUSING**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse impacts on population, housing, and employment depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project on population, housing, and employment from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential population, housing, and employment impacts is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed projects in place. The following analyses of population, housing, and employment impacts include assessments of growth inducing effects of future new projects for population, housing, and employment in comparison with growth forecasted in adopted plans, and assessment of displacement of housing and people or need for replacement housing elsewhere as a result of future new projects.

Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as “a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment” (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is “significant,” generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant population, housing, and employment impacts if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- Induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly.
- Displace substantial number of existing housing.

- Displace substantial number of people necessitating construction of replacement housing.
- The proposed project would produce additional population, housing or employment inconsistent with adopted plans either in terms of overall amount or location.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential population, housing, and employment impacts from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on population, housing, and employment. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts to population, housing, and employment is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in impacts to population and housing by inducing growth, such that it exceeds adopted population or housing projections for the planning area or sub-region in which the development site is located, potentially creating or removing jobs, displacing existing housing and people, or creating new housing. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to population, housing, and employment as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include potential increases in population, housing, and jobs in the area. Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, these facilities may result in displacement of housing and population.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.13-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on population, housing, and employment. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities may result in an increase in population, housing, or jobs in the area; however, the growth is likely to be consistent with the adopted plans and policies. In addition, the agricultural projects are likely to be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, and thus, the resulting displacement of people and housing as a result of construction of the facility would not be significant. Accordingly, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impact or no impact on population, housing, and employment in the document. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on population, housing, and employment identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a) Substantial Growth.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts for inducing substantial growth directly or indirectly. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that construction and operation of future individual projects in this facility category could result in significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts on substantial growth from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.13-1  
Population and Housing Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |                                   |                            |                           |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   |                            |                           |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                    |                            |                           |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |                                   |                            |                           |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b> |                            |                           |
|   | <b>a) Induce Growth</b>           | <b>b) Displace Housing</b> | <b>c) Displace People</b> |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>  |                                   |                            |                           |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR   | LS                                | LS                         | LS                        |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                                      | LS                                | NE                         | NE                        |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                       |                                   |                            |                           |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                               | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR   | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                          | LS                                | LS                         | LS                        |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                                      | LS                                | LS                         | LS                        |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                           | LS                                | LS                         | LS                        |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                       | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                               | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR  | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                                      |                                   |                            |                           |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel, EIR  | LS                                | LS                         | LS                        |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR  | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR  | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                        | LS                                | LS                         | LS                        |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR   | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR   | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR   | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                                   | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                       | LS                                | N                          | N                         |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                            |                                   |                            |                           |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR                  | LS                                | N                          | N                         |

**TABLE 5.13-1 (Continued)**  
**Population and Housing Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                     |                    |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   | N – No impacts                  |                     |                    |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                                      |                                 |                     |                    |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                 | Significance Determination      |                     |                    |
|  | a) Induce Growth                | b) Displace Housing | c) Displace People |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR                               | LS                              | LS                  | LS                 |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR   | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                                | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>  |                                 |                     |                    |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR   | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                                       | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                                     | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                                    | LS                              | LS                  | LS                 |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR  | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR  | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR   | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                                    | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR   | LS                              | LS                  | LS                 |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR                            | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LS                              | LS                  | LS                 |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.                                    | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR                               | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |                                 |                     |                    |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR                              | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LS                              | LS                  | LS                 |

**TABLE 5.13-1 (Concluded)**  
**Population and Housing Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                     |                    |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                  |                     |                    |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |                                 |                     |                    |
|   | Significance Determination      |                     |                    |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed  | a) Induce Growth                | b) Displace Housing | c) Displace People |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>   |                                 |                     |                    |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility  | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR  | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR   | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR   | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>  |                                 |                     |                    |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | LS                              | LS                  | LS                 |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | LS                              | N                   | N                  |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |                                 |                     |                    |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LS                              | LS                  | LS                 |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N                               | N                   | N                  |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |                                 |                     |                    |

**b, c) Displacements of Housing and People Necessitating Replacement Housing.**

One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact for displacement of housing and people or necessitating the need for replacement housing, while the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to such issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could displace a large number of housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts regarding displacements from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the last five years identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential for displacement of people and housing or increase in population, housing, and jobs in the area which are not consistent with the projections of adopted plans and policies. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.13-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on population, housing, and employment, including potential increases in population, housing, and jobs in the area. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved

the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings, which were found in the CEQA document surveyed to result in less-than-significant impacts on population, housing, and employment as most retail and service establishments surveyed are located in developed urban areas and are largely consistent with adopted plans and policies for a specific area. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on population, housing, and employment identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Substantial Growth.** All eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts for inducing substantial growth directly or indirectly. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that construction and operation of future individual projects in this facility category could result in significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts on substantial growth from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b, c) Displacements of Housing and People Necessitating Replacement Housing.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for displacement of housing and people or necessitating the need for replacement housing. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could displace a large number of housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts regarding displacements from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-years period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new

construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, and parking structures. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for displacement of people and housing or increases in population, housing, and jobs in the area. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.13-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on population, housing, and employment, including potential increases in population, housing, and jobs in the area. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to result in less-than-significant impacts on population, housing, and employment as most of the commercial facilities are located in developed urban areas and are largely consistent with adopted plans and policies for a specific area. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on population, housing, and employment identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Substantial Growth.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts for inducing substantial growth directly or indirectly. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that construction and operation of future individual projects in this facility category could result in significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts on substantial growth from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c) Displacements of Housing and People Necessitating Replacement Housing.**

The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for displacement of housing and people or need for replacement housing. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could displace a large number of housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts regarding displacements from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Accordingly, based on these historical data, a small number of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities are anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have a low potential for displacement of people and housing or increase in population, housing, and jobs in the area which are not consistent with the projections of adopted plans and policies. Therefore, entertainment/recreational projects would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to have significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.13-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on population, housing, and employment, including potential increases in population, housing, and jobs in the area. These projects were determined in the CEQA documents surveyed to result in less-than-

significant impacts on population, housing, and employment as most entertainment/recreational facilities surveyed are located in developed urban areas and are largely consistent with adopted plans and policies for a specific area. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on population, housing, and employment identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Substantial Growth.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts for inducing substantial growth directly or indirectly. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that construction and operation of future individual projects in this facility category could result in significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts on substantial growth from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c) Displacements of Housing and People Necessitating Replacement Housing.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for the displacement of housing and people or need for replacement housing. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could displace a large number of housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts regarding displacements from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would have a low potential for displacement of people and housing or increase in population, housing, and jobs in the area. Therefore, these future facilities would have a low likelihood of resulting in significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.13-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on population, housing, and employment, including potential increases in population, housing, and jobs in the area. These projects were determined in the CEQA documents surveyed to result in less-than-significant impacts on population, housing, and employment as most institutional facilities surveyed are located in developed urban areas and are largely consistent with adopted plans and policies for a specific area. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on population, housing, and employment identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Substantial Growth.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for inducing substantial growth directly or indirectly. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that construction and operation of future individual projects in this facility category could result in significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts on substantial growth from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c) Displacements of Housing and People Necessitating Replacement Housing.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for the displacement of housing and people or need for replacement housing. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5

in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could displace a large number of housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts regarding displacements from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data, as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting. However, any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for displacement of people and housing or increase in population, housing, and jobs in the area. Therefore, transportation facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant population, housing, and employment impacts. However, the potential exists for one or more future transportation-related projects to have significant population, housing, and employment impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.13-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on population, housing, and employment, including potential increases in population, housing, and jobs in the area which are not consistent with the projections of adopted plans and policies. These projects were determined in the CEQA documents surveyed to result in less-than-significant impacts on population, housing, and employment as most of these projects were located in developed mixed-use,

industrial, and commercial zoned areas and are largely consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on population, housing, and employment identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Substantial Growth.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either no impact or less-than-significant impacts for inducing substantial growth directly or indirectly. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that construction and operation of future individual projects in this facility category could result in significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts on substantial growth from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b, c) Displacements of Housing and People Necessitating Replacement Housing.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for the displacement of housing and people or need for replacement housing. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could displace a large number of housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts regarding displacements from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g.,

boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed in industrial zoned areas and would have a low potential for displacement of people and housing or increase in population, housing, and jobs in the area. Therefore, utility projects would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future utility projects to have significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.13-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects illustrate the type of impacts on population, housing, and employment, including potential increase in population, housing, and jobs in the area. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, were determined in the CEQA documents surveyed to result in less-than-significant impacts on population, housing, and employment as most of the facilities are located on industrial zones lands or lands zoned for utilities. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on population, housing, and employment identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Substantial Growth.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either no impacts or a less-than-significant impact for inducing substantial growth directly or indirectly. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that construction and operation of future individual projects in this facility category could result in significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts on substantial growth from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b, c) Displacements of Housing and People Necessitating Replacement Housing.**

The four CEQA documents surveyed for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed no impacts for displacement of housing and people or necessitating the need for replacement housing. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could displace a large number of housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts regarding displacements from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings that would have a low potential for displacement of people and housing or increase in population, housing, and jobs in the area. Therefore, light industrial/warehouse facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future light industrial/warehouse projects to have significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 4.2-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on population, housing, and employment, including potential increases in population, housing, and jobs in the area. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures were determined in the CEQA documents surveyed to result in less-than-significant impacts on population, housing, and employment as most of the facilities are located on industrial zones lands or lands zoned for utilities. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall

summary of the types of population, housing, and employment impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Substantial Growth.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts for inducing substantial growth directly or indirectly. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that construction and operation of future individual projects in this facility category could result in significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts on substantial growth from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b, c) Displacements of Housing and People Necessitating Replacement Housing.**

The four CEQA documents for the proposed project indicated that these past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for displacement of housing and people or necessitating the need for replacement housing. Based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could displace a large number of housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts regarding displacements from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that

would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. These facilities have a low potential for displacement of people and housing or increase in population, housing, and jobs in the area. Therefore, heavy industrial facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future heavy industrial projects to have significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 4.2-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the type of impacts on population, housing, and employment, including potential increase in population, housing, and jobs in the area which are not consistent with the projections of adopted plans and policies. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to result in no significant adverse impacts on population, housing, and employment as most of the facilities are located on industrial zones lands. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on population, housing, and employment identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Substantial Growth.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or a less-than-significant impact for inducing substantial growth directly or indirectly. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that construction and operation of future individual projects in this facility category could result in significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts on substantial growth from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b, c) Displacements of Housing and People Necessitating Replacement Housing.** The three CEQA documents surveyed for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for displacement of housing and people or necessitating the need for replacement housing. However,

based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could displace a large number of housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to population and housing could be significant. Therefore, impacts regarding displacements from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to population, housing, and employment that were either no impacts or less-than-significant. However, there remains a potential for significant adverse impacts generated by future projects approved under the project by inducing significant population, housing, or employment growth directly or indirectly over existing conditions or growth that it is not consistent with the adopted plans and policies for a specific area, or displace large number of housing, and people necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, population, housing, and employment impacts as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects" [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez) and proposed SB 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill, which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD’s internal offset accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, or SB 827 or by obtaining offsets on the open market. The construction and operation of past development projects have resulted in certain increases in population, housing and jobs within the district. However, the population increases from the past projects were within current projections for the region (see Environmental Setting section for future population and employment projections in the study areas). Based on the past trends, it is likely that any future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts would be consistent with existing zoning and general plan land use designations and, thus, would be consistent with projections for the region. Nonetheless, improvements to infrastructure are likely as a result of construction of these future facilities, and new housing to accommodate anticipated growth would be required, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The growth that could indirectly occur due to the proposed project could contribute to those significant environmental impacts. In addition, it is possible that existing housing units and residents could be displaced as a result of construction of future facilities, though the exact number or nature of such displacement cannot be predicted absent information on specific future projects.

While none of the past projects were specifically identified as having the potential to have significant adverse population, housing, and employment impacts, and it is not currently known when, where, or how much development or new construction would occur, the evaluation of population, housing, and employment impacts is even more uncertain.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG’s El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

Both the El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects were determined by the CEC to have no significant adverse impacts on population and housing and the Sentinel project will mitigate potential population and housing impacts to less than significant. The construction of the El Segundo project is not expected to result in workers moving to the area for construction or permanent jobs according to the FSA prepared by the CEC. The

FSA determined that if for some reason a few workers did temporarily relocate, there was a housing vacancy rate of four to six percent in El Segundo, Hawthorne, and other nearby cities, so CEC staff does not expect any significant impact on housing from the construction of the El Segundo project. The CEC determined that the operation of the project could result in a possible shortage of workers in some trades, creating an influx of new population, having impacts on housing. However, The CEC concluded the population and housing impact would be less than significant because of the size of Los Angeles County and available labor force.

The CEC determined that the Walnut Creek project would largely use local labor and, thus, not create any significant adverse impacts on the area's population and housing. An analysis by the project proponent shows 88 construction workers may be non-local (from outside of Los Angeles County), which constitutes 40 percent of the average construction workforce or 22 percent of the peak construction workforce as the maximum potential population increase. CEC staff does not expect any housing to be displaced (moved) as a result of this project and sufficient vacant housing (e.g., hotels/motels and RV parks) exists and is available to accommodate any workers that elect to temporarily relocate to the study area.

The FSA for the Sentinel project states the project would use local and regional labor and would not create any significant adverse impacts on the area's housing. According to the FSA, the number of construction workers (total onsite staff) would range from 27 in the first month of construction to 371 in the sixth month of construction, the peak period with an average number of workers onsite over the course of the 18-month construction period would be 212. However, as stated in the FSA, construction laborers are not expected to relocate for the 18-month construction period. If they did, the CEC determined the local area has adequate and available owner-occupied and rental housing, as well as motel/hotel accommodations and recreational vehicle sites. Given the availability of housing, motel and hotel rooms, and mobile home parks and the fact that most workers would be commuting on a daily basis, staff does not expect this project to adversely impact local housing during construction. The CEC determined approximately 28 percent of the entire millwright labor force in the metropolitan area would be working at the proposed project placing a potential significant impact on population and housing as millwrights could travel from the Los Angeles area in order to meet the demand of construction projects in Riverside County, although the project job would be for a relatively short period of time and millwrights typically travel from job site to job site during the construction season in order to make a living. According to the FSA, the operation of the project would have 10 skilled full-time employees and four part-time employees. Even if the employees relocated to the local area, based on the housing availability discussed earlier, CEC staff does not expect that the 14 full- and part-time employees would have difficulty finding housing within Riverside County and relocation of 14 full- and part-time employees and their families would not create a substantial increase in population. To mitigate, the project proponent stated that it is committed to give local preference in hiring and procurements so impacts to population and housing will be less than significant.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative population and housing impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Population and Housing Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant population and housing impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse population and housing impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for population and housing impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of population and housing impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant population and housing impact, the potential exists for future indirect population and housing impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.14**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES – PUBLIC SERVICES**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse physical impacts which may require expanded government facilities or services depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential impacts the proposed project would have on public services from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of public services impacts is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed projects in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse indirect impacts on public services include assessments of impacts on fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities which may be caused by future new projects.

Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant impacts on public services if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- Impacts on public services would be considered significant if the project would result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response time

or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and other public facilities.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential impacts on public services from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on public services for a given area. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts to public services is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse impacts on public services. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in facilities and developments that could create a need for new or expanded public facilities and/or services in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse impacts on public services have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future. On a programmatic level, impacts to public services as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may create a need for new or expanded fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.14-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on public services. Based on a review of these documents, agricultural-related facilities may be of substantial size, which may result in construction-related impacts associated with reduced response time for fire and police protection services. However, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures for public services. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, b) Fire and/or Police Protection (Emergency Services).** Both of the CEQA documents for the proposed project indicated that these past projects in the agricultural facility category (without or with mitigation) resulted in less-than-significant impacts on emergency services. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that would create a need for new or expanded fire or police facilities and services to maintain acceptable response times or where there are already deficiencies in public services (e.g., fire and police staffing and equipment issues), which could exacerbate existing conditions such that significant adverse impacts on emergency services could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency services resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.14-1**  
**Public Services Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                      |            |          |                            |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------|----------|----------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       | N – No impacts                  |                      |            |          |                            |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination      |                      |            |          |                            |
|  | a) Fire Protection              | b) Police protection | c) Schools | d) Parks | e) Other public facilities |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>                                   |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR                                    | LSM                             | LSM                  | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                               | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                        | LS                              | LS                   | LSM        | N        | N                          |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR                                  | LSM                             | LSM                  | LSM        | LSM      | LS                         |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Spec. Plan EIR                      | LSM                             | LSM                  | N          | LS       | N                          |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                               | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LSM      | N                          |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Dev. EIR                           | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                | LS                              | LS                   | N          | N        | LS                         |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                        | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LS       | NE                         |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | LSM                             | LSM                  | LS         | LSM      | LS                         |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                               |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel  | LS                              | LS                   | LSM        | LS       | LS                         |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR                                     | LS                              | LSM                  | LS         | N        | LS                         |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR                                 | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | N        | N                          |
| 14. Corbin & Nordoff Redev. Project EIR                          | LSM                             | LSM                  | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LSM      | LS                         |

**TABLE 5.14-1 (Continued)**  
**Public Services Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                      |            |          |                            |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------|----------|----------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       | N – No impacts                  |                      |            |          |                            |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination      |                      |            |          |                            |
|  | a) Fire Protection              | b) Police protection | c) Schools | d) Parks | e) Other public facilities |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR                                  | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LSM      | LS                         |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR                                  | LSM                             | LSM                  | LSM        | LSM      | LSM                        |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                            | LS                              | LS                   | LSM        | LSM      | LSM                        |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                | LSM                             | LSM                  | LSM        | LSM      | LS                         |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                     |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR           | LSM                             | LSM                  | N          | N        | N                          |
| 21. LA Live -Sports & Entertainment District EIR                 | LSM                             | LSM                  | LSM        | S        | LSM                        |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR                                     | LSM                             | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Dev. Project EIR                       | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>                                  |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR                         | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                       | LS                              | LS                   | N          | N        | LS                         |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supp. EIR                            | LSM                             | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                    | LSM                             | LS                   | N          | LS       | LSM                        |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR                              | LSM                             | LS                   | N          | N        | N                          |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR                              | N                               | N                    | LSM        | N        | LS                         |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR                         | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |

**TABLE 5.14-1 (Continued)**  
**Public Services Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                      |            |          |                            |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------|----------|----------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   | N – No impacts                  |                      |            |          |                            |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination      |                      |            |          |                            |
|  | a) Fire Protection              | b) Police protection | c) Schools | d) Parks | e) Other public facilities |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Reloc. EIR  | LS                              | LS                   | N          | N        | N                          |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR   | LSM                             | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Sr. Sec. School Project EIR  | LS                              | LSM                  | NE         | NE       | NE                         |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.  | N                               | N                    | N          | N        | N                          |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | LS                              | LS                   | N          | N        | NE                         |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | N        | LS                         |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Exp. (Berths 136-147 EIR   | LS                              | LS                   | N          | N        | LS                         |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | LS                              | LS                   | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LSM                             | LSM                  | LSM        | LSM      | LSM                        |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>  |                                 |                      |            |          |                            |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | LSM                             | LSM                  | LSM        | LSM      | LSM                        |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | LS                              | LS                   | N          | N        | N                          |

**TABLE 5.14-1 (Concluded)**  
**Public Services Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant   |                            | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |            |          |                            |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------|----------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |                            | N – No impacts                  |            |          |                            |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |                            |                                 |            |          |                            |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed  | Significance Determination |                                 |            |          |                            |
|   | a) Fire Protection         | b) Police protection            | c) Schools | d) Parks | e) Other public facilities |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Ctr. EIR   | LS                         | LS                              | N          | N        | LS                         |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR   | N                          | N                               | N          | N        | N                          |
| <b>Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities</b>  |                            |                                 |            |          |                            |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | LS                         | LS                              | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | LS                         | LS                              | LS         | N        | LS                         |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Dev. Project EIR   | LS                         | LS                              | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | LSM                        | LS                              | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |                            |                                 |            |          |                            |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | LS                         | LS                              | N          | N        | N                          |
| 51. SRG Chino South Indus. Park Project EIR   | LS                         | LS                              | LS         | LS       | LS                         |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N                          | N                               | N          | N        | N                          |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |                            |                                 |            |          |                            |

**c, d, e) School Services, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Other Public Facilities.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts to schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in school enrollment capacities and existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential to create impacts on fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts on public services in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts on public services.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.14-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on public services, which involve physical impacts associated with the provision of, or need for, new or expanded fire, police, school, parks and recreation, and library facilities or services. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction

or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures in similar settings, some of which were found to result in potential impacts on public services, including the following:

- Conflicts with local fire code pertaining to commercial and residential land uses, which may require the addition or expansion of fire protection facilities and services.
- Increased demand for public services resulting from indirect growth, impacts, which may require the addition or expansion public services facilities.
- Construction period traffic delays and congestion, which may impact fire and police services to a point where acceptable response times are no longer feasible.

However, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on public services. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Fire and/or Police Protection (Emergency Services).** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) to emergency services. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that would create a need for new or expanded fire or police facilities and services to maintain acceptable response times or where there are already deficiencies in public services (e.g., fire and police staffing and equipment issues), which could exacerbate existing conditions such that significant adverse impacts on emergency services could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency services resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d) School Services and Parks and Recreational Facilities.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts to schools and parks and recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on schools or parks and

recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in school enrollment capacities and existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on schools or parks and recreational facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Other Public Facilities.** Review of seven of the eight CEQA documents surveyed past projects in the retail/service facility category mostly disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts on libraries and other public facilities; one CEQA document did not discuss impacts on other public services. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on other public facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on other public facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential to create impacts on public services in the future. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts on public services. However, the potential

exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant adverse impacts on public services.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.14-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on public services, including potential adverse effects on fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, some of which were found to result in the following types of impacts:

- Increases in population, use of land, and intensity of usage, which resulted in an increased demand for fire protection, police protection, and schools. Such increases in demand could require expansion of emergency services staff or facilities and new or expanded school facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios (student capacity or police officer-to-population ratios) and response times.
- Construction-related impacts to school access including detours, lane closures, and general traffic delays.
- Indirect population growth and increases in demand for parks, recreational facilities, libraries, and other public facilities such that new or expanded public service facilities would be required.

However, project-specific impacts were not considered significant impacts in the CEQA documents surveyed since most of the commercial facilities are located in developed urban areas and are largely accessible to surrounding public services, and those impacts considered potentially significant could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Fire and/or Police Protection (Emergency Services).** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on emergency services. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that would create a need for new or expanded fire or police facilities and services to maintain acceptable response times or where there are already deficiencies in public services (e.g., fire and police staffing and equipment issues), which could exacerbate existing conditions such that significant adverse impacts on emergency services could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency services resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) School Services, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Other Public Facilities.** Review of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts to schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in school enrollment capacities and existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Accordingly, based on these historical data a small number of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities is anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to create structures or developments that could create a need for new or expanded public services and facilities of an area. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse impacts on public services.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.14-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the

development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on public services, including physical impacts associated with the provision of, or need for, new or expanded fire, police, school, parks and recreation, and library facilities or services. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including mid- to high-rise buildings, parking structures, outdoor lighting and signage, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were determined to result in potential impacts on public services, such that the following would occur:

- Increases in population, use of land, and intensity of usage would result in an increased demand for fire protection, police protection, and schools. Such increases in demand could require expansion of emergency services staff or facilities and new or expanded school facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios (student capacity or police officer-to-population ratios) and response times.
- Conflict with parkland requirements/standard (i.e., park space per 1,000 residents ratio).

Accordingly, one of these projects was found to have significant impacts on public services. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Fire and/or Police Protection (Emergency Services).** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on emergency services. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that would create a need for new or expanded fire or police facilities and services to maintain acceptable response times or where there are already deficiencies in public services (e.g., fire and police staffing and equipment issues), which could exacerbate existing conditions such that significant adverse impacts on emergency services could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency services resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **School Services.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on schools. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on schools or where there are already deficiencies in school enrollment capacities, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on schools from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Parks and Recreational Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that for three of the four projects, environmental impacts on parks and recreational facilities were less than significant or no impact. However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #21 – LA Live-Sports & Entertainment District), the lead agency concluded that this project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on parks and recreational facilities due to conflicts with the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks' standards on park/recreational space to residents ratio (4 acres/1,000 residents), resulting from the construction of the project. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on parks and recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on parks and recreational facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Other Public Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on other public facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could

create significant adverse impacts on other public facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on other public facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and, therefore, would have a low potential to create a need for new or expanded public services or facilities. Therefore, these future facilities would have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts on public services. However, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse impacts on public services.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.14-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on public services, including physical impacts to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities which would result in a need for new or expanded public services. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities, some of which were found to result in potential impacts on public services such that one or more of the following would occur:

- Construction period traffic delays and congestion, which may impact fire and police services to a point where acceptable response times are no longer feasible.

- Increased demand for public services resulting from indirect growth, which may require the addition or expansion public services facilities.
- Project proximity to schools, which may result in adverse impacts to schools resulting from construction-related noise, traffic delays, and general nuisance-like impacts associated with the construction and operation of certain institutional projects, such as churches.

However, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on public services. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Fire and/or Police Protection (Emergency Services).** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation or no impacts on emergency services. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that would create a need for new or expanded fire or police facilities and services to maintain acceptable response times or where there are already deficiencies in public services (e.g., fire and police staffing and equipment issues), which could exacerbate existing conditions such that significant adverse impacts on emergency services could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency services resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) School Services, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Other Public Facilities.** Review of 14 of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation or no impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to these issues. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in school enrollment capacities and existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, and impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting. However, any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential to create a need for new or expanded fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities, or other public facilities. Therefore, transportation facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant impacts on public services. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant adverse impacts on public services.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.14-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on public services, which involve physical impacts associated with the provision of, or need for, new or expanded fire, police, school, parks and recreation, and library facilities or services of an area. The CEQA documents for the transportation projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, bus storage and maintenance facilities, and mixed-use residential and commercial facilities, some of which were found to result in potential impacts on public services such that construction period traffic delays and congestion may impact fire and police services, schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities to a point where acceptable service ratios

and response times are no longer feasible. However, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on public services. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Fire and/or Police Protection (Emergency Services).** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on emergency services. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that would create a need for new or expanded fire or police facilities and services to maintain acceptable response times or where there are already deficiencies in public services (e.g., fire and police staffing and equipment issues), which could exacerbate existing conditions such that significant adverse impacts on emergency services could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency services resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) School Services, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Other Public Facilities.** Three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in school enrollment capacities and existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities are not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity and the distributed nature of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Although these facilities would typically be constructed in industrial zoned areas, these facilities may be sited near or directly adjacent to sensitive residential neighborhoods and publicly accessible open spaces. The potential scale and scope of operations at a typical large scale industrial utility may result in conditions, such as industrial emergencies, additional criminal activity (in unsupervised industrial areas surrounding the utility structure), and increased worker populations, that may necessitate increased use of public services. Adverse impacts to emergency services, schools, parks and recreational facilities, as well as other public facilities may occur. Therefore, the potential exists for future construction and operation of utility facilities to generate significant adverse impacts on public services.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.14-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on provisions of public services. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, could create a need for new or expanded public services and facilities resulting in significant adverse impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Fire and/or Police Protection (Emergency Services).** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on emergency services. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future

individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that would create a need for new or expanded fire or police facilities and services to maintain acceptable response times or where there are already deficiencies in public services (e.g., fire and police staffing and equipment issues), which could exacerbate existing conditions such that significant adverse impacts on emergency services could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency services resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) School Services, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Other Public Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures or no impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in school enrollment capacities and existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data and the assumption that the annual percentage of newly constructed physical activities would be five percent, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings that could

require moderate amounts of construction activities, which may result in significant adverse impacts on public services.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.14-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on public services, including potential adverse effects on fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in potential impacts on public services such that one or both of the following may occur:

- Increased demand for schools resulting from indirect growth, which could create impacts that may require the addition or expansion public services facilities.
- Construction period traffic delays and congestion, which may impact fire and police services to a point where acceptable response times are no longer feasible.

However, adverse effects were not found to be significant in the CEQA documents surveyed since most of these facilities were located in developed urban industrial areas and largely compatible with the surrounding public services. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts on public services identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Fire and/or Police Protection (Emergency Services).** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on emergency services. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that would create a need for new or expanded fire or police facilities and services to maintain acceptable response times or where there are already deficiencies in public services (e.g., fire and police staffing and equipment issues), which could exacerbate existing conditions such that significant adverse impacts on emergency services could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency services resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) School Services, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Other Public Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in school enrollment capacities and existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. The potential scale and scope of operations at a typical large heavy industrial facility may result in conditions, such as industrial emergencies, additional criminal activity (in unsupervised industrial areas surrounding the utility structure), and/or increased worker populations, that may necessitate increased use of public services. Adverse impacts to emergency services, schools, parks and recreational facilities, as well as other public facilities may occur. Therefore, these future heavy industrial facilities have the potential of generating significant adverse impacts on public services.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.14-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on public services, including potential adverse effects on fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other

public facilities. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities generally were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to not result in significant impacts to public services. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Fire and/or Police Protection (Emergency Services).** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impact or less-than-significant impacts on emergency services. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that would create a need for new or expanded fire or police facilities and services to maintain acceptable response times or where there are already deficiencies in public services (e.g., fire and police staffing and equipment issues), which could exacerbate existing conditions such that significant adverse impacts on emergency services could occur.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency services resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c, d, e) School Services, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Other Public Facilities.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either no impacts or less-than-significant impacts to schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in school enrollment capacities and existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to public services could be significant. Therefore, impacts on schools, parks and recreational facilities, and other public facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

## Summary of Findings

The review of the 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to public services that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documents also found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts related to standards on park and recreational land service ratios. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on public services as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

## Cumulative Impacts

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects." [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez) and proposed SB 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill, which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal offset accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. Past development patterns within the district have resulted in a variety of different impacts to public services, some of which would be cumulatively significant. Development projects, while individually responsible for less-than-significant impacts, would potentially result in cumulative impacts due to growth in population and subsequent increased demand for police, fire, school, recreational and other public services. Thus, any future development within the district, resulting from the project, would potentially add to this cumulatively considerable increase in demand for public services. As noted above, since the specific location of individual facilities cannot

be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative public service impacts is even more uncertain.

However, some of the past projects were determined to have significant adverse impacts on public services, including the potential to impact standards on park and recreational land service ratios.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The FSA prepared for the El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects concluded that there will be no significant adverse impacts on public services and the FSA for the Sentinel project determined impacts on public services could be mitigated to less than significant. The FSA for the El Segundo project concluded that since temporary workers are not expected to move to and/or bring families to El Segundo or nearby communities during the construction period, there is not expected to be any impact on the need for school facilities. Fire protection is provided by the El Segundo Fire Department, which has 54 firefighters and paramedics operating from two fire stations with the closest station staffing ten employees per shift, and, according to the FSA, the response time to the site is approximately three to five minutes. Police protection is provided by the El Segundo Police Department, with 69 authorized sworn officers plus a support staff. The FSA states that on-duty patrol staff ranges from three to eight officers and response time to the project site is under four minutes. The closest hospital with full emergency services is the Robert F. Kennedy Medical Center in Hawthorne, approximately four miles northeast of the site, and there are industrial medical clinics in El Segundo and several other medical centers five to 10 miles from the project site. Finally, according to the FSA, the City of El Segundo imposes development impact fees based on the gross square foot of building area to finance fire, police, and library services, a fee that will be required by the El Segundo project. Thus, CEC staff believes that the El Segundo project would not cause a significant adverse direct or cumulative impact on schools or public services such as fire and police.

If 88 non-local (outside of Los Angeles County) construction workers were to relocate as a result of the Walnut Creek project, approximately 97 school-aged children would be added to Los Angeles County school enrollment, which CEC staff concluded would be a very small impact (less than one percent of Los Angeles County school enrollment for the entire county). During the operations phase, a workforce of nine would result in a worst-case scenario of 22 school children, if the workers were to relocate to the City of Industry. If these children were to go to school districts close to the project, it would be

less than one percent, which, CEC concludes, is a small impact on schooling. Law enforcement of the City of Industry is provided by a station of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department which has 200 sworn and 34 civilian personnel and for an emergency, the response time is five minutes or less and for a non-emergency it is five to thirty minutes. According to the FSA, the Walnut Creek project would be located within an industrial area that is currently served by the local fire department and fire risks at the proposed project do not pose significant added demands on local fire protection services. CEC staff concludes that the Los Angeles County Fire Department Hazmat Team is adequately equipped and staffed to respond to more serious hazardous materials incidents at the Walnut Creek facility with an adequate response time. The nearby hospital is 5.9 miles from the project site and emergency medical services are provided by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department with a response time for emergency medical service of slightly over three minutes. The CEC determined there should be no significant adverse impacts on parks within Los Angeles County due to the small construction and operational workforce that could be relocating from outside the county. CEC staff concluded that construction and operation of the Walnut Creek project would not cause a significant direct or cumulative adverse impact on the area's schools, law enforcement, fire protection, emergency services, and hospitals.

During construction of the Sentinel project, the CEC anticipates most of the labor force would commute daily from within Riverside County and that the addition of project-related children to schools at or over capacity may increase costs in terms of supplies, equipment, and/or teachers but the impact would be small. The CEC concludes this worst-case scenario is unlikely to occur since any nonlocal construction workers would not likely relocate family members for the relatively short duration of construction. For operation of the Sentinel project, CEC estimates 14 full- and part-time operation workers are expected to be hired from the local labor force of Riverside County, which would result in the addition of 14 school children to the Palm Springs Unified School District, an increase of less than one percent that is considered a small impact. The Palm Desert Police Department (PDPD), consisting of 78 sworn deputy sheriff positions, provides police protection services to the unincorporated areas of Riverside County in the north Palm Springs area where the Sentinel project is located. The FSA reports the response time to the project area would be less than five minutes and the city of Palm Springs Police Department (PSPD) would provide law enforcement services to the project site and vicinity in the event that the PDPD needs assistance. According to the FSA, the PSPD has 89 fulltime officers, 60.5 civilian officers, 32 non-sworn volunteers, and 26 reserve officers. According to the FSA, the Sentinel project would be located in the city of Palm Springs within an industrial area whose fire support is currently served by the Palm Springs Fire Department (PSFD) with the response time of about 10 minutes from the closest station to the project site. The FSA determined that Palm Springs has one general hospital, Desert Regional Medical Center, with a 393-bed capacity, located 6.2 miles to the south of the project site and is the closest hospital to the proposed project site, with an estimated seven to 10 minutes' driving time to the site. CEC staff does not expect the construction or operation workforces to have a significant adverse impact on parks because of the number and variety of parks within the regional project area. In addition, the CEC anticipates that construction workers are unlikely to bring their families to a work site, and therefore, impact existing park services. Thus, the CEC

concludes the Sentinel project would not create any significant adverse impacts on the area's schools, law enforcement, fire protection, emergency services, hospitals, or parks.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project, are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative public services impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Impacts on Public Services**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant public services impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse public services impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for public services impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of public services impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant public services impact, the potential exists for future indirect public services impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.15**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES – RECREATION**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse impacts on recreation depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project on recreation from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential recreation impacts is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed project in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse impacts on recreation include assessments of impacts to the region's demand for parks and recreational facilities, as well as other recreational opportunities. Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant impacts on recreation if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- The project would result in an increased demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.
- The project would adversely affect existing recreational opportunities.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential impacts on recreation from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The

analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on recreation. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of recreation impacts is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse impacts on existing recreational facilities and resources. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in development adjacent to sensitive resources that could affect the recreational opportunities of a site and its surroundings. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse impacts on recreation have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to revisit existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to recreation as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include impacts to local and regional parks or other recreational facilities resulting from increased demand for recreational facilities. Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses and would not include recreational elements, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to parks or other recreational facilities that provide the primary source of recreation for a particular area. Activities related to the operation of agricultural facilities may result in significant adverse impacts to recreation.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.15-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern

Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on recreation, including potential increases in demand for parks and other recreational facilities, physical impacts to existing recreational facilities or locations, and construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have adverse effects on the environment. However, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts on recreation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of recreation impacts identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

- a) Increase in the Demand for Existing Local and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to the increased demand for parks or other recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing local and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts on existing local and regional parks or other recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** Both of the CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts resulting from construction or expansion of recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could lead to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, thereby resulting in adverse impacts to the environment.

---

and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.15-1  
Recreation Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |                                   |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   |  |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                    |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |                                   |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b> |  |
|   | <b>a) Use of existing Parks</b>   | <b>b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities</b> |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>  |                                   |  |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR   | LS                                | LS   |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                                      | LS                                | LS   |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                       |                                   |  |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                               | N                                 | N  |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR   | LSM                               | LSM  |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                          | LS                                | LS   |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                                      | LS                                | LSM  |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                           | LS                                | LS   |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                       | LS                                | LS   |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                               | LS                                | LS   |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR  | LSM                               | LS   |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                                      |                                   |  |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel   | LS                                | LS   |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR  | N                                 | N  |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR  | LS                                | LS   |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                        | LS                                | LS   |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR   | LS                                | LS   |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR   | LS                                | LS   |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR   | LSM                               | LSM  |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                                   | LS                                | LS   |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                       | LSM                               | LSM  |

**TABLE 5.15-1 (Continued)**  
**Recreation Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |   |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   | N – No impacts                  |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                                      |                                 |   |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                 | Significance Determination      |   |
|  | a) Use of existing Parks        | b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                                     |                                 |   |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR                           | LS                              | LS  |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR                               | S                               | S   |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR   | LS                              | LS  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                                | LS                              | LS  |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>  |                                 |   |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR   | LS                              | LS  |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                                       | N                               | LS  |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                                     | LS                              | LS  |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                                    | LS                              | LS  |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR  | LS                              | N   |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR  | N                               | N   |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR   | LS                              | LS  |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                                    | N                               | LS  |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR   | LS                              | LS  |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | LS                              | LS  |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR                            | N                               | N   |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LS                              | LS  |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.                                    | N                               | N   |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | N                               | N   |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR                               | N                               | N   |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |                                 |   |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR                              | N                               | N   |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR | N                               | N   |

**TABLE 5.15-1 (Concluded)**  
**Recreation Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |                                   |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>   |  |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                    |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |                                   |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>   | <b>Significance Determination</b> |  |
|   | <b>a) Use of existing Parks</b>   | <b>b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities</b> |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR   | LS                                | LS   |
| <b>Utility Projects (Includes Power Plants)</b>   |                                   |  |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility  | LSM                               | LSM  |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR  | N                                 | N  |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR   | N                                 | N  |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR   | LS                                | LS   |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>  |                                   |  |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | LSM                               | LS   |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | LSM                               | LSM  |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | LS                                | LS   |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | LS                                | LS   |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |                                   |  |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | N                                 | N  |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LS                                | LS   |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | N                                 | N  |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |                                   |  |

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts

related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential to increase demand for parks and other recreational facilities or to result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities such that adverse impacts to the environment would occur. Therefore, retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts to recreation in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts on recreation.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail/service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.15-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on recreation, including potential adverse effects related to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities and the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Based on a review of these documents, retail service facilities may result in adverse impacts from the increase in residents and employees within the area surrounding a project site, such that demand for parks and recreational facilities would increase leading to accelerated deterioration of recreational facilities and facilities. However, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of recreation impacts identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

- a) **Increase in the Demand for Existing Local and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to increases in demand for parks and other recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a

location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing local and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the increased demand for parks and recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation or no impact related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that would require alteration, expansion, or construction of recreational facilities which could result in significant adverse impacts to the environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings and parking structures/lots. Based on historical data, new large commercial facilities would likely be constructed within existing developed commercial, retail, mixed-use residential, and transit-oriented areas and would, therefore, have a low potential to increase demand for parks and other recreational facilities or to result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities such that adverse impacts to the environment would occur. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant adverse impacts to

recreation in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant adverse impacts on recreation.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.15-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on recreation, including potential adverse effects related to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities and the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found to result in adverse impacts related to increases in residents and employees within the area surrounding a project site, such that the demand for parks and recreational facilities would increase and the construction or expansion of recreational facilities may be required. However, project-specific impacts were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on recreation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of recreation impacts identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Increase in the Demand for Existing Local and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to increases in demand for parks and other recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing local and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the increased demand for parks and recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3

in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that would require alteration, expansion, or construction of recreational facilities which could result in significant adverse impacts to the environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Accordingly, based on these historical data and a small number of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities is anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities. Based on historical data, entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to alter undeveloped open space and natural areas that may result in the alteration of existing parks or recreational facilities, or require construction of new or expanded recreational facilities. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse impacts on recreation.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.15-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on recreation, including potential adverse effects related to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, and conflicts with applicable standards on service ratios. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, parking lots, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were found to result in conflicts with local standards on service ratios and increases in demand for existing parks and recreational facilities. However, most of these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts on recreation. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of recreation impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Increase in the Demand for Existing Local and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that for three of the four projects, environmental impacts related to increases in demand for parks and other recreational facilities were less than significant. However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #21 – LA Live-Sports & Entertainment District), the lead agency concluded that this project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on parks and recreational facilities due to conflicts with the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks’ standards on park/recreational space to residents ratio (4 acres/1,000 residents), resulting from the construction of the project. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on parks and recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on existing local and regional parks or other recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that for three of the four projects, environmental impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities were less than significant. However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #21 – LA Live-Sports & Entertainment District), the lead agency concluded that this project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on parks and recreational facilities due to conflicts with the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks’ standards on park/recreational space to residents ratio (4 acres/1,000 residents), resulting from the construction of the project, which is entertainment and recreational in nature. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that would require alteration, expansion, or construction of recreational facilities which could result in significant adverse impacts to the environment.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to the construction or expansion of

recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and parking lots. Most of these facilities would be constructed within existing commercial, residential, and institutional zoned areas and therefore, would have a low potential to alter existing recreational facilities. Therefore, these facilities would generally have a low likelihood of resulting in significant adverse impacts to recreation in the future. However, some of the future institutional facilities would involve an increased use of existing parks, or construction/expansion of recreational facilities, and, as such, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to have significant adverse impacts on recreation.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.15-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on recreation, including potential adverse effects related to the construction or expansion of new recreational facilities or an increase in demand for existing parks or other recreational facilities. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities, which have the potential to result in significant impacts resulting from increases in demand for existing parks or other recreational facilities or from the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities. However, project-specific impacts were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or no impacts on recreation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of recreation impacts identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Increase in the Demand for Existing Local and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to increases in demand for existing local and regional parks or other recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained

offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing local and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts on existing local and regional parks or other recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts resulting from the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category near a location that would require alteration, expansion, or construction of recreational facilities which could result in significant adverse impacts to the environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail,

shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities). Any new transportation-oriented facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial, commercial, mixed-use, and transportation-zoned areas and would not include the construction or expansion of new recreational facilities. Therefore, transportation-oriented facilities would have a low potential to create impacts on existing parks or recreational facilities. However, the potential exists for one or more future transportation-related projects to have significant adverse impacts on recreation.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.15-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on recreation, including potential adverse effects related to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, and conflicts with applicable standards on service ratios. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, and bus storage and maintenance facilities, some of which were found to result in temporary construction impacts that would disrupt existing park and recreational facility operations in the area, but were determined to be not significant in the CEQA documents surveyed. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of recreation impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Increase in the Demand for Existing Local and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts related to demand for existing parks and recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing local and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to the increased demand for parks and recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts resulting from the construction or

expansion of recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that would require alteration, expansion, or construction of recreational facilities, which could result in significant adverse impacts to the environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity and the distributed nature of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. Any new utility project would most likely be constructed within an already developed area and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of existing recreational facilities. Nonetheless, the potential exists for one or more future utility-related projects to have significant adverse impacts on recreation.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.15-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have on recreation, including potential adverse effects related to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities and the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, could result in visual impacts to existing recreational facilities, as well as potential increases in

demand for parks and recreational facilities. However, project-specific impacts were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures on recreation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of recreation impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Increase in the Demand for Existing Local and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to demand for existing parks or other recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing local and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the increased demand for parks and recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility-oriented facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to construction or expansion of recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that would require alteration, expansion, or construction of recreational facilities, which could result in significant adverse impacts to the environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts resulting from the construction or expansion of recreational facilities from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1).

However, based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, new light industrial/warehouse facilities that would be constructed in the future would likely involve the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type buildings. Any new light industrial/warehouse facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial and commercial-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of existing recreational facilities. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant impacts on recreation.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.15-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have on recreation, including potential adverse effects related to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities and the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of warehouse-type and office-type structures may result in increased demand for existing parks or recreational facilities, physical impacts to existing parks or recreational facilities, and/or new or expanded recreational facilities, the construction of which could create significant adverse impacts to the environment. However, project-specific impacts were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures on recreation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of recreation impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Increase in the Demand for Existing Local and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to increases in demand for parks or other recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing local and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time

the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the increased demand for parks and recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that would require alteration, expansion, or construction of recreational facilities, which could result in significant adverse impacts to the environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas. Because the analysis of recreation impacts is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be affected by the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas. Any new heavy industrial facility would most likely be constructed within existing industrial and commercial-zoned areas and would, therefore, have a low potential for alteration of existing recreational facilities. However, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant adverse impacts on recreation.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.15-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on recreation, including potential adverse effects related to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities and the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the demolition and construction of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could result in an increase of demand for existing parks or other recreational facilities, but were determined to be not significant in the CEQA documents surveyed. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of recreation impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Increase in the Demand for Existing Local and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts related to demand for existing parks or other recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in a location that could create significant adverse impacts on existing local and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that acceptable service ratios would not be met or where there are already deficiencies in the existing levels of service, which could exacerbate these existing conditions.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the increased demand for parks and recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a location that would require alteration, expansion, or construction of recreational facilities, which could result in significant adverse impacts to the environment.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different

environmental settings, impacts to recreation could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to recreation that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documents also found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts on recreation, including potential adverse effects related to the construction or expansion of new recreational facilities, conflicts with applicable standards on acceptable park facility service ratios, and increased demand for existing parks or other recreational facilities, but were determined to be not significant. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on recreation as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects." [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez), proposed SB 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal offset accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. Past development patterns within the district have resulted in a variety of different impacts to recreational services and facilities, some of which would

be cumulatively significant. Development projects, while individually responsible for less-than-significant impacts, would potentially result in cumulative impacts due to growth in population and subsequent increased demand for recreational services and facilities. Thus, any future development within the district resulting from the project would potentially add to this cumulatively considerable increase in demand for recreational services. As noted above, since the specific location of individual facilities cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative recreational impacts is even more uncertain.

However, some of the past projects were determined to have significant adverse impacts on recreation, including the potential to impact standards on park and recreational land service ratios.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The El Segundo and Walnut Creek project were determined by the CEC to have no significant recreation impacts and the Sentinel project will mitigate recreational impacts to less than significant. According to the CEC, parks and recreational open space are located along the coast west of the El Segundo project. One landscape mitigation measure would involve the installation of public park type benches along the west property line, which would benefit the existing recreational space. Thus, the CEC concludes no adverse impacts to recreation from the El Segundo project.

The FSA prepared by the CEC for the Walnut Creek project concluded that because the project would use largely local labor, this would not create any significant adverse impacts on the area's parks and recreation. CEC staff used a conservative estimate provided by the applicant that 22 percent (88 workers) of peak construction workforce would be non-local (outside of Los Angeles County) and their dependents would not likely follow them, so many non-local workers would still be within commuting distance from neighboring counties. The CEC describes this is a small number of construction workers for a short term activity. Also, the CEC estimates up to nine operations workers would be needed and would commute from Los Angeles County, so overall, most of the construction and operation labor force would be from Los Angeles County. Therefore, the CEC concludes that there should be no significant adverse impacts on parks and recreation resources within Los Angeles County as a result of the Walnut Creek project.

Similar to the Walnut Creek project, the CEC anticipated that the Sentinel project would use local and regional labor so would not create any significant adverse impacts on the area's parks and recreation. The FSA discussed the nearby 794,000-acre Joshua Tree

National Park managed by the U.S. Department of the Interior National Parks Service is located just a few miles east of Desert Hot Springs where recreational activities are available at the park including backpacking, camping, mountain biking, rock climbing, geologic tours, birding, horseback riding, and star gazing. Also, according to the FSA, within Riverside County, the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District is an independent agency governed by a board of supervisors that manages and operates more than 44,000 acres, which includes 40 parks, reserves, historic, or archaeological sites and 90 miles of regional trails. Finally, the FSA describes Desert Hot Springs itself has six parks within its city limits: Arroyo Park, Constitution Park, Eastside Park, Hot Springs Park, Mission Springs Park, and Wardman Park. CEC staff does not expect the construction or operation workforces to have a significant adverse impact on parks and recreation because of the number and variety of parks within the regional project area. In addition, the CEC concludes that construction workers are unlikely to bring their families to a work site, and therefore, impact existing parks and recreation.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative recreation impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Recreation Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant recreation impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts that are limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse recreation impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for recreation impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of recreation impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant recreation impact, the potential exists for future indirect recreation

impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.16**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES – SOLID/HAZARDOUS WASTE**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction and operation of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to result in adverse impacts related to solid/hazardous waste, depending upon the nature of the project. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential impacts related to solid/hazardous waste that may result from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential solid/hazardous waste impacts is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed project in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse indirect impacts related to solid/hazardous waste include assessments of impacts regarding sufficient capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs and compliance with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal that may be caused by future new projects.

Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is "significant," generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant impacts related to solid/hazardous waste if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- The generation and disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous waste would exceed the capacity of designated landfills.
- Failure to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid and hazardous waste.

## IMPACT ANALYSIS

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential solid/hazardous waste impacts from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have related to solid/hazardous waste in the district. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction and operation of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse impacts related to solid/hazardous waste. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in solid/hazardous waste impacts in the event that development projects or existing facility modifications occur on a scale great enough to exceed capacities of local or regional waste disposal sites or produce quantities or types of hazardous waste that would not conform with existing disposal regulations. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse solid/hazardous waste impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### Potential Solid/Hazardous Waste Impacts of Identified Facility Categories

#### Agricultural Facilities

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the last five years identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g., San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to reevaluate existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

Examples of agricultural facilities that may be constructed in the future include dairy farms, crop farms, wineries, livestock and poultry farms, and potentially different types of food processing facilities. On a programmatic level, impacts related to solid/hazardous waste as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include increased solid waste resulting from agricultural operations, such as harvesting, livestock

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

management, dairy operations, food processing, or other agricultural operations, such as winery facilities. While agricultural facilities typically operate on a large scale, much of the solid waste would consist of biodegradable crop wastes, or in the case of a cattle ranch or dairy operation, in the form of cattle manure. Due to the unknown nature of any specific future agricultural projects, significant adverse impacts related to solid/hazardous wastes may occur.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.16-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have related to solid/hazardous waste, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs and conflicts with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal. For the CEQA documents analyzed, as discussed above, much of the solid wastes that result from these types of agricultural facilities consist of biodegradable crop wastes and cattle manure. Manure is typically used on-site as fertilizer for cropland or is collected and trucked off the site for sale and use on nearby fields as fertilizer. This aspect of manure management for a typical dairy facility would be regulated according to local agricultural policies. Therefore, there is a low likelihood of significant impact as a result of agricultural facilities. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to landfill capacities.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, indirect impacts related to insufficient landfill capacities as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.16-1  
Solid Hazardous Waste Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>        |  |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                         |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                             |  |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b> | <b>Significance Determination</b>      |  |
|   | <b>a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity</b> | <b>b) Compliance with Federal, State, Local Statutes</b> |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>  |  |  |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                                      | LS                                     | NE   |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                       |  |  |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                               | N                                      | N  |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                          | S                                      | LS   |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                                      | LS                                     | LS   |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                           | LS                                     | LS   |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                       | LS                                     | LS   |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                               | LS                                     | LS   |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR  | NE                                     | NE   |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                                      |  |  |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel EIR   | S                                      | N  |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR  | LS                                     | LS   |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR  | LS                                     | LS   |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                        | LS                                     | LS   |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR   | S                                      | LS   |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                                   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                       | LSM                                    | LSM  |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                            |  |  |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR                  | LS                                     | LS   |

**TABLE 5.16-1 (Continued)**  
**Solid Hazardous Waste Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |   |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   | N – No impacts                  |   |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                                      |                                 |   |
|  | Significance Determination      |   |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                 | a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity | b) Compliance with Federal, State, Local Statutes |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR                               | N                               | N   |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR   | LS                              | LS  |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                                | LS                              | LS  |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>  |                                 |   |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR   | LS                              | LS  |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                                       | LS                              | LS  |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                                     | LS                              | LS  |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                                    | LS                              | LS  |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR  | LS                              | LS  |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR  | NE                              | NE  |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR   | NE                              | NE  |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                                    | LS                              | LS  |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR   | LS                              | LS  |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR   | S                               | LS  |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR                            | LSM                             | LSM   |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | LS                              | LS  |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.                                    | N                               | N   |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | N                               | N   |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR                               | LS                              | LS  |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |                                 |   |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR                              | N                               | N   |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR | LS                              | N   |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | NE                              | NE  |

**TABLE 5.16-1 (Concluded)**  
**Solid Hazardous Waste Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| S – Significant   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>        |  |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  | N – No impacts                         |  |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |  |  |
|   | <b>Significance Determination</b>      |  |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>   | <b>a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity</b> | <b>b) Compliance with Federal, State, Local Statutes</b> |
| <b>Utility Projects (Includes Power Plants)</b>   |  |  |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility  | LSM                                    | LSM  |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR  | LS                                     | LS   |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR   | N                                      | N  |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR   | LS                                     | LS   |
| <b>Light Industrial Warehouse Facilities</b>  |  |  |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR  | N                                      | N  |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR  | LS                                     | LS   |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | LS                                     | LS   |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | LS                                     | LS   |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |  |  |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LS                                     | LS   |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | LS                                     | LS   |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |  |  |

**b) Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Regulations.** One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact related to compliance with applicable waste disposal regulations; the other CEQA document did not discuss this topic. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in

the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas that would result in significant adverse effect related to compliance with applicable federal, state, and local solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, indirect impacts related to conflicts with federal, state and local solid/hazardous waste regulations as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, most future new or modified facilities would be constructed within existing developed retail and mixed-use residential areas based on historical data and would have a low potential for resulting in substantially increased amounts or new types of solid/hazardous wastes. Furthermore, it would be expected that all future development projects would generally conform to all established solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations. Therefore, individual retail/service facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts related to solid/hazardous waste in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future retail/service projects to have significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.16-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have related to solid/hazardous waste, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs and conflicts with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal, that may be caused by future new projects. The CEQA documents for the retail and service projects surveyed involved the construction or remodeling and reconfiguration of low- and medium-scale offices, retail stores, and shopping centers or the construction of new high-rise structures, the construction and operation of which would result in solid/hazardous waste disposal. However, project-specific impacts were generally not considered significant impacts in the CEQA

documents surveyed as most retail and service establishments surveyed are located in developed urban areas with sufficient landfill disposal capacity and would conform to all applicable waste disposal regulations. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) **Sufficient Landfill Capacity.** Six of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts related to sufficient landfill capacity were concluded to be less-than-significant or no impact; one CEQA document did not discuss impacts related to this issue. However, for one project (Project #5 – Shops at Santa Anita Park), the lead agency concluded that the retail/service facility category has the potential to generate significant unavoidable impacts due to the projected substantial increase in waste expected to be generated by 1,300 new employees at the larger facility and the fact that local landfill facilities would have insufficient capacity or would close after 2029.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to landfill capacity as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) **Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Regulations.** Seven of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/service facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impact or no impacts related to compliance with applicable waste disposal regulations; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas that would result conflict with waste disposal regulations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to compliance with waste disposal regulation resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas with existing energy supply services.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, most of the new commercial facilities that are constructed in the future would involve medium and high-rise buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting, the construction and operation of all of which may result in substantially increased amounts or new types of solid/hazardous wastes. However, it would be expected that all future development projects would generally conform to all established solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations. Therefore, these facilities would have a low likelihood of resulting in significant adverse impacts related to solid/hazardous waste in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future large commercial projects to have significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.16-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have related to solid/hazardous waste, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs and conflicts with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal. The CEQA documents for the large commercial projects surveyed involved the construction of medium- and large-scale buildings within existing urban areas, which were found to result in less-than-significant impacts related to solid/hazardous waste. However, while project-specific impacts were generally less-than-significant in the CEQA documents surveyed, some significant adverse impacts were disclosed related to landfill capacity. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity.** Seven of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts related to sufficient landfill capacity were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation) or no impact. However, for two projects (Projects #11 – Sunset Doheny Hotel and #17 – Metro Universal), the lead agencies concluded that the large commercial projects have the potential to generate significant unavoidable impacts due to the projected near-term closure of contracted landfill facilities.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to landfill capacity as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Regulations.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to compliance with applicable waste disposal regulations. However, based on

SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas that would result conflict with waste disposal regulations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to compliance with waste disposal regulation resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Accordingly, based on these historical data, a small number of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities is anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, those new facilities that would be constructed in the future may involve the construction of medium and large scale buildings, landscaping, parks, and other public facilities, the construction and operation of all of which may result in substantially increased amounts or new types of solid/hazardous wastes. While it would be expected that all future development projects would generally conform to all established solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations, due the large scale, public use and patronage of some such facilities (NFL stadiums, etc.), it is likely that a substantial impact related to solid/hazardous waste may occur. Therefore, the potential exists for one or more future entertainment/recreational projects to generate significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.16-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have related to solid/hazardous waste, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs and conflicts with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal. These projects involved a variety of different structures, including medium to high-rise buildings, parking structures, outdoor lighting, and grading and landscaping of open space areas for outdoor recreational facilities, which were determined in the CEQA documents surveyed to have a less-than-significant impact related to solid/hazardous

waste. More specifically, the following discussion provides an overall summary of the types of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreation facility category disclosed either less-than-significant or no impacts related to sufficient landfill capacity.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to land fill capacity as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Regulations.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant or no impacts related to compliance with applicable waste disposal regulations. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas that would result conflict with waste disposal regulations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to waste disposal regulations resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, new institutional facilities that would be constructed in the future would involve low-, medium-, or large-scale buildings, parking structures, and outdoor lighting, the construction and operation of all of which may result in substantially increased amounts or new types of solid/hazardous wastes. However, it would be expected that all future development projects would generally conform to all established solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations. These future facilities would have a moderate likelihood of resulting in significant

solid/hazardous waste impacts. Accordingly, the potential exists for one or more future institutional projects to generate significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.16-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have related to solid/hazardous waste, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs, and conflicts with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal. Some of these projects involved the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of low-, medium-, and large-scale buildings, landscaping, parks, playfields and gymnasiums associated with schools, hospital buildings, and other public facilities in developed urban areas with sufficient landfill disposal capacity and would conform to all applicable waste disposal regulations. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity.** 12 of the 15 CEQA for past projects in the institutional facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts related to sufficient landfill capacity were concluded to be either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts; two of the CEQA documents did not discuss impacts related to this issue. However, for one project (Project #33 – USC Health Sciences Campus), the lead agency concluded that this institutional project has the potential to generate significant unavoidable impacts due to the concerns of exceeding the capacity of landfill service providers.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to solid/hazardous waste as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**b) Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Regulations.** 13 of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to compliance with applicable waste disposal regulations; the other two CEQA documents did not discuss impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas that would result conflict with waste disposal regulations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to waste disposal regulations resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, these types of facilities may involve low- and medium-scale buildings, transportation equipment storage yards, parking structures, rail, shipping, airport facilities, and transportation-related uses (e.g., rail yards, transit centers, shipping depots, docks, cranes, runways, terminals, support facilities), and outdoor lighting, all of which may result in substantially increased amounts or new types of solid/hazardous wastes. While it would be expected that all future development projects would generally conform to all established solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations, the potential exists for one or more future projects to have significant adverse impacts related to solid/hazardous wastes.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.16-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have related to solid/hazardous waste, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs and conflicts with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal. These projects typically involved the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a variety of new structures, including low- and medium-scale buildings, the use of large-scale cranes, and shipping infrastructure, and bus storage and maintenance facilities, which were generally found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have less-than-significant impacts related to solid/hazardous waste. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impact related to sufficient landfill capacity; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to landfill capacity as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Regulations.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed no impacts related to compliance with applicable waste disposal regulations; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to this issue. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas that would result conflict with waste disposal regulations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to compliance with waste disposal regulations resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the last five years identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some type of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. These facilities would typically be constructed in industrial zoned areas with sufficient access to waste disposal services. However, due to the scale and nature of these facilities and their operations, the construction and operation of utility projects would have a high likelihood to result in substantially increased amounts or new types of solid/hazardous wastes.

While it would be expected that all future development projects would generally conform to all established solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations, power generation, water treatment, sewage, and solid waste treatment facilities may generate large amounts of new solid and hazardous waste, which would either need to be (re)processed, disposed of on-site, or transported to other waste disposal facilities. Therefore, future construction and operation of utility facilities could generate significant adverse impacts related to solid/hazardous waste.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.16-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have related to solid/hazardous waste, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs and conflicts with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal. However, based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction, modification, or renovation of a variety of structures, including underground pipelines, water storage tanks, groundwater recharge equipment, landfills, smoke stacks, flares, and power generating equipment, would have a low likelihood for impacts related to solid/hazardous waste. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity.** The four CEQA documents for the past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to sufficient landfill capacity.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to landfill capacity as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Regulations.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to compliance with applicable waste disposal regulations. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas that would result conflict with waste disposal regulations. Additionally, while it is expected that future utilities, including waste disposal facilities, would comply with all established federal, state, and local regulation regarding waste disposal, the facilities could include unique or unusual design characteristics that could require increased waste disposal requirements that are

different from those reviewed for this PEA, which could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to compliance with waste disposal regulations resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas with adequate power utility infrastructure services.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility, for all of which construction and operation activities would potentially result in substantially increased amounts or new types of solid/hazardous wastes. On a programmatic level, it would be expected that all future development projects would generally conform to all established solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations. Therefore, individual light industrial/warehouse facilities would generally have a low likelihood of creating significant adverse impacts related to solid/hazardous waste in the future. However, the potential exists for one or more future light industrial/warehouse projects to have significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.16-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have related to solid/hazardous waste, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs and conflicts with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction of one- to three-story warehouse-type and office-type structures may in result in increased waste disposal demands. However, adverse effects were not found to be significant in the CEQA documents surveyed since these facilities are located in existing developed urban areas with adequate access to waste disposal services and landfill capacity, and would not result in conflicts with waste disposal regulations. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industry/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to sufficient landfill capacity.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to landfill capacity as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Regulations.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industry/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to compliance with applicable waste disposal regulations. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas that would result conflict with waste disposal regulations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to compliance with waste disposal regulations resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, those new heavy industrial facilities that would be developed in the future as a result of implementing the proposed project would involve the construction of medium- to large-scale industrial buildings, with machinery, boilers, pumps, fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, mining and extraction equipment, and raw material storage areas, the construction and operation of all of which could potentially result in substantially increased amounts or new types of solid/hazardous wastes. Furthermore, while it would be expected that all future development projects would generally conform to all established solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations, it is likely that these types of projects could have significant adverse impacts related to landfill capacity and solid/hazardous waste disposal regulations. Therefore, these future heavy industrial facilities have the potential of generating significant adverse impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.16-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have related to solid/hazardous waste, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs and conflicts with local, state, and federal regulations regarding solid and hazardous waste disposal. Based on the evaluation of these projects, the construction and operation of fuel storage tanks, refinery equipment, and associated support facilities, and concrete warehouse type buildings, raw material storage, and associated shipping and transportation facilities could result in the generation of increased amounts or different kinds of solid/hazardous wastes, or potential impacts related to conflicts with waste disposal regulations. Nonetheless, the surveyed projects generally determined in the CEQA documents surveyed to have a less-than-significant impact related to solid/hazardous waste. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts related to solid/hazardous waste identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

- a) Sufficient Landfill Capacity.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to sufficient landfill capacity.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to landfill capacity as a result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- b) Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Regulations.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category that have or could have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to compliance with applicable waste disposal regulations. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in areas that would result conflict with waste disposal regulations.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, solid/hazardous waste impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on energy resources related to compliance with waste disposal regulations resulting from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

## **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to solid/hazardous wastes that were either less-than-significant (without or with mitigation) or no impacts. However, four different projects disclosed significant unavoidable impacts related to landfill capacity. Based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff's independent judgment, and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to solid/hazardous waste as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects" [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez) and proposed SB 388 (Calderon), which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD's internal offset accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining offsets on the open market. The construction and operation of virtually every past development project has resulted in some quantity of solid and/or hazardous waste. While most projects typically conform to federal, state, and local waste disposal regulation, the capacity of the various local and regional waste disposal facilities, including processing and recycling centers, landfills, and hazardous waste disposal facilities is finite. Generally over time, existing landfills and disposal sites will gradually reach capacity, eventually necessitating the construction and use of new disposal facilities. Any future development within the district resulting from the project would cumulatively contribute to the reduction in the available remaining capacity at existing landfills and disposal sites. Since the specific amount and type of wastes that would be

potentially produced by future unknown facilities cannot be predicted with certainty, the evaluation of cumulative solid/hazardous waste impacts is even more uncertain.

However, some of the past projects were determined to have significant adverse impacts related to solid/hazardous wastes, including impacts regarding capacity of existing landfills for solid waste needs.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

All three of the power plant projects, according to their respective FSAs, generated significant adverse solid waste impacts that could be mitigated to less than significant. The El Segundo FSA determined the waste will be generated during construction, including demolition of existing structures, site preparation, and construction of the generating plant; and during operation of the project associated with handling, storing, and disposing of project-related hazardous and nonhazardous wastes. According to the FSA, nonhazardous wastes generated during operation are expected to be similar to those generated by the present facility and include trash, paper, wood, plastic, cardboard, broken and rusted metal and machine parts, defective electrical materials, empty containers, and other typical worker-generated solid wastes. Hazardous wastes, the CEC determined, are likely to be generated during routine project operation include oily water, combustion turbine generator (CTG) wash water, heat recovery steam generator wash water, spent selective catalytic reduction catalysts, and minimal amounts of used cleaning solvents. CEC staff also determined that much of the hazardous waste generated during facility construction and operation will be recycled, such as used oil and spent catalysts. The mitigation measures proposed in the FSA include obtaining a hazardous waste generator identification number; notifying when any impending waste management-related enforcement action is taking place; preparing and submitting to the Los Angeles County Department of Hazardous Materials for review and approval; employing a Registered Professional Engineer or Geologist, with experience in remedial investigation and feasibility studies for consultation during soil excavation and grading activities; suspending construction activity at that location if potentially contaminated soil is unearthed for the protection of workers or the public; preparing a Remedial Investigation Workplan; and surrounding the entire site by a berm or other solid structures capable of containing any runoff from the site and preventing this runoff from leaving the site. Finally, CEC staff concluded the management of the wastes for the El Segundo project will be in compliance with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS), which ensures that wastes generated during constructing and operating the proposed project will be managed in an environmentally safe manner.

The Walnut Creek FSA prepared by the CEC determined waste generated during construction and operation of the Walnut Creek project or waste associated with remediation of existing on-site contamination would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts if the mitigation measures are implemented. According to the Walnut Creek FSA, site preparation and construction of the proposed generating plant and associated facilities would generate both nonhazardous and hazardous wastes in liquid and solid forms including metal debris from welding/cutting activities, packing materials, electrical wiring, and empty non-hazardous chemical containers. The CEC determined that hazardous wastes anticipated to be generated during construction include welding materials, paint, flushing and cleaning fluids, solvents, asbestos containing materials, and lead-based paint for a total of approximately 3,000 pounds of hazardous waste generated from the construction phase of the project. The FSA states that nonhazardous solid wastes anticipated to be generated during the operation of the project include up to 37 tons of waste annually, comprised of maintenance wastes and office wastes, with non-recyclable wastes regularly transported offsite to a solid waste disposal facility. The FSA further states that area drains will be located by mechanical equipment where oil could mix with rainwater or other water sources and then sent to an oil-water separator, which separates out any oil before the effluent goes to the collection tank via an underground drain line with the oil-contaminated fluid pumped out by a vacuum truck on an as-needed basis and disposed of at a facility specifically qualified to handle each waste. The CEC staff determined that hazardous wastes anticipated to be generated during routine project operation include waste lubricating oil, lubrication oil filters from the combustion turbines, spent Selective Catalytic Reduction catalyst, oily rags, cooling tower sludge, laboratory analysis waste, oil sorbents, and chemical feed area drainage. Mitigation measures to reduce potential significant solid waste impacts to less than significant outlined in the Walnut Creek FSA include the following: employ a Registered Professional Engineer or Geologist, who shall be available for consultation during soil excavation and grading activities; suspend construction activity at that location if potentially contaminated soil is unearthed for the protection of workers or the public; obtain a hazardous waste generator identification number from the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC); notify the construction project manager (CPM) upon becoming aware of any impending waste management-related enforcement action; prepare a Construction Waste Management Plan and an Operation Waste Management Plan for all wastes generated during construction and operation of the facility, respectively; submit both plans to the CPM for review and approval; ensure that the site is properly characterized and remediated if necessary through an approved workplan; and ensure that the cooling tower sludge is tested and report the findings to the CPM. The project proponent states that handling and management of operational waste would follow the hierarchical approach of source reduction, recycling, treatment, and disposal; and CEC staff concludes the quantities of hazardous waste generated during operation would not significantly impact the treatment and disposal resources available in California. Finally, CEC staff concludes that the Walnut Creek project would comply with all applicable LORS regulating the management of hazardous and non-hazardous wastes during facility construction and operation.

Site preparation and construction of the Sentinel power plant project and associated facilities, according to the FSA, would generate both nonhazardous and hazardous wastes

in solid and liquid forms and all wastes would be recycled to the extent possible. The FSA states that non-hazardous solid wastes generated during construction would include wood, concrete, metal, paper, glass, and plastic and all non-hazardous solid wastes would be recycled to the extent possible and non-recyclable wastes would be collected by a licensed hauler and disposed in a solid waste disposal facility. Also according to the FSA, non-hazardous liquid wastes would also be generated during construction including sanitary wastes, storm water runoff, pipe hydrotesting, and equipment wash water. Hazardous wastes anticipated to be generated during construction, according to the FSA, include empty hazardous material containers, solvents, waste paint, welding materials, oil absorbents. The CEC concluded that during construction, 3,816 cubic yards of non-hazardous solid waste, 306 cubic yards of hazardous solid waste, 858,000 gallons of non-hazardous liquid waste, and 1,584 gallons of hazardous liquid waste would be generated. During operation, the FSA states that non-recyclable non-hazardous solid waste would be primarily from the zero liquid discharge (ZLD) system solids produced by that process and spent CTG air filters with wastes disposed of at an appropriately licensed landfill. Potentially hazardous liquid waste from the CTG wash water could result from the operation of the Sentinel according to the FSA. The CEC determined that hazardous wastes expected to be generated during routine project operation include used hydraulic fluids, oils, greases, oily filters and rags, spent selective catalytic reduction catalyst, cleaning solutions and solvents, and batteries. The CEC concluded that during operation, 33,870 cubic yards of non-hazardous solid waste, 360 cubic yards of hazardous solid waste, 300,000 gallons of non-hazardous liquid waste, and no gallons of hazardous liquid waste would be generated. In order to mitigate the significant adverse solid and hazardous waste impacts to less than significant the following measures are listed in the Sentinel FSA: employ a Registered Professional Engineer or Geologist, who shall be available for consultation during soil excavation and grading activities; suspend construction activity at that location if potentially contaminated soil is unearthed for the protection of workers or the public; comply with Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) procedures for abandonment of an orphaned oil or gas wells; conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment along the proposed natural gas and water pipeline corridors before construction begins; develop and implement a Construction Waste Management Plan; ensure that spills or releases of hazardous substances, hazardous materials, or hazardous wastes associated with the construction or operation of the project are reported, delineated, cleaned-up, and remediated; notify the CPM upon becoming aware of any impending waste management-related enforcement action; obtain a hazardous waste generator identification number from the U.S. EPA; prepare an Operation Waste Management Plan for all wastes generated during operation of the facility, and shall submit the plan to the CPM, DTSC, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for review and approval; conduct annual analyses of the solids residue from the ZLD process to determine if the solids are hazardous or non-hazardous and ensure appropriate disposal of the solids residue; and submit annual compliance reports to the CPM documenting the annual volumes of wastes generated and the method used to manage the waste generated, such as recycling or disposal. Finally, CEC staff concludes that the Sentinel project would comply with all applicable LORS regulating the management of hazardous and nonhazardous wastes during both facility construction and operation.

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative solid/hazardous waste impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Solid/Hazardous Waste Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant solid and hazardous waste impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse solid and hazardous waste impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for solid and hazardous waste impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of solid and hazardous waste impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant solid and hazardous waste impact, the potential exists for future indirect solid and hazardous waste impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.17**

---

# **INDIRECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES – TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

**Introduction**

**Impact Analysis**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project would provide offsets, which can be a necessary step in obtaining approval for a facility. Therefore, the proposed Rule 1315 project has the potential to create indirect adverse impacts in the future from siting, constructing, and operating individual facilities containing stationary pollutant sources that qualify to receive emissions offsets available from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts. Construction of new or modified structures in future new facilities obtaining emissions offsets from the SCAQMD's internal offset accounts have the potential to generate adverse traffic and transportation impacts depending upon the nature of the project, its location, and its setting. The following section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the potential impacts the proposed project would have on traffic and transportation from the construction and operation of future new facilities.

### **Methodology**

The methodology for determining the significance of potential traffic and transportation impacts is based on comparing the existing setting to expected future conditions with the proposed projects in place. The following analyses of potentially significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts include assessments of impacts due to increased traffic, inadequate parking, hazardous design features, inadequate emergency access, and effects on alternative mode of transportation that may be caused by future new projects.

Mitigation measures would be identified on a project-by-project basis and would be the responsibility of the lead agencies based on their underlying legal authority to mitigate project impacts.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as “a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment” (Public Resource Code § 21068). Although there is no ironclad rule as to when an impact is “significant,” generally, the questions presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines can serve as significance criteria, unless a particular agency has developed its own, more specific criteria. To the extent that the proposed project results in siting, constructing, and operating future facilities, these future new projects have the potential to generate significant traffic and transportation impacts if their implementation would result in any of the following:

- Peak period levels on major arterials would be disrupted to a point where level of service (LOS) is reduced to D, E, or F for more than one month or the amount of unacceptable reduction specified in any applicable local plan or ordinance.
- An intersection's volume to capacity ratio increase by 0.02 (two percent) or more when the LOS is already D, E, or F or the amount of unacceptable reduction specified in any applicable local plan or ordinance.

- A major roadway is closed to all through traffic, and no alternate route is available.
- There is an increase in traffic (e.g., 350 heavy-duty truck round-trips per day) that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.
- The demand for parking facilities is substantially increased.
- Water borne, rail car, or air traffic is substantially altered.
- Traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians are substantially increased.
- Result in inadequate emergency access.
- Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

## **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion presents an evaluation of potential traffic impacts from future facilities that would be eligible for offsets under the proposed project. The analysis is organized according to the primary facility categories and the potential impacts they may have on traffic and circulation of a given area. Based on the information described in Subsection 5.0, a large majority of stationary source equipment permits would be for the installation of new or replacement equipment at existing facilities. Because the analysis of impacts to traffic and transportation is qualitative in nature as explained in Subchapter 5.0, the determination of the types of impacts and the level of significance of potential facility-level project impacts will not be based on the number of newly constructed or pre-existing facilities. Therefore, information on the number of new facilities is intended for informational purposes only.

Construction of any new future facility or modification of any existing facility in the future has the potential to create significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts. Such future new or modified facilities could potentially result in increase in daily or peak hour traffic, exceed the established level of service standards for a street segment or an intersection, increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking, and interfere with the implementation of alternative transportation system plans and policies. While the specific nature or degree of such impacts is currently unknown, potentially significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts have been analyzed based on available information pertaining to each facility category.

### **Potential Impacts of Identified Facility Categories**

#### **Agricultural Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 14 agricultural facilities or less than one percent of the total permit applications (see Table 5.0-1). In addition, there is an estimated annual two percent migration of dairy livestock operations from the Chino-Ontario-Norco area to other parts of California (e.g.,

San Joaquin Valley) or to areas outside the state due to economic pressures to reevaluate existing land uses (e.g., agricultural, dairy) due to encroaching urbanization.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is unlikely that a large number of new agricultural facilities would be constructed in the district in the future.

On a programmatic level, impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of constructing future new agricultural facilities may include potentially increasing traffic substantially over existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, exceed level of service standards for designated roads and highways, cause hazards due to design feature or through incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking capacity or emergency access, or conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation systems. Although agricultural facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for agricultural uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to incompatible uses. These above-mentioned factors may result in significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for agricultural projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.17-1). The two selected CEQA documents,<sup>2</sup> which were prepared for a winery and a county General Plan Dairy Element, illustrate the types of impacts that agricultural-related projects would have on traffic and transportation, including substantial increase in daily and peak hour over existing traffic loads and capacity, exceedance of established level of service standards, inadequate parking capacity and access, and conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation system. Accordingly, these projects were found to have less-than-significant traffic and transportation impacts. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of impacts traffic and transportation identified in the two CEQA documents surveyed for this facility category.

**a, b) Substantial Increase in Traffic over Existing Traffic Loads and Capacity and resulting in Exceedance of Established Levels of Service.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing traffic loads and capacity and exceedance

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 1127 – Emission Reductions from Livestock Waste (SCAQMD, August 2004).

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that no available documents were found for projects within the district; the two selected documents for agricultural facilities were for projects in San Mateo County and Kings County in northern and central California, respectively. Although these projects are not located within the district, their environmental documents illustrate the types of impacts that may result from the development of such projects.

**TABLE 5.17-1  
Transportation/Traffic Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  |                            | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       |                            | N – No impacts                  |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |                            |                                 |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination |                                 |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
|  | a) Increase in Traffic     | b) Level of Service Standard    | c) Air Traffic Patterns | d) Increase of Hazards | e) Emergency access | f) Parking Capacity | g) Alternative Transportation |
| <b>Agricultural Facilities</b>                                   |                            |                                 |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| 1. Clos de la Tech Winery EIR                                    | LSM                        | S                               | N                       | N                      | LS                  | LS                  | N                             |
| 2. Kings County Dairy Element PEIR                               | LSM                        | LSM                             | NE                      | LS                     | LS                  | NE                  | NE                            |
| <b>Retail/Services Facilities</b>                                |                            |                                 |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| 3. Medical Office Neg. Dec. in Long Beach                        | LS                         | LS                              | N                       | N                      | LS                  | LSM                 | N                             |
| 4. Wilshire La Brea Project EIR                                  | LSM                        | LS                              | NE                      | NE                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 5. Shops at Santa Anita Park Specific Plan EIR                   | S                          | S                               | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LSM                 | LS                            |
| 6. Archstone Hollywood Project EIR                               | LSM                        | LS                              | NE                      | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LSM                           |
| 7. 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development EIR                    | S                          | LS                              | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 8. 1427 Fourth Street Project EIR                                | S                          | S                               | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | N                             |
| 9. Westfield Fashion Square Expansion EIR                        | LSM                        | LSM                             | NE                      | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 10. New Century Plan EIR   | S                          | LSM                             | NE                      | NE                     | LSM                 | LSM                 | LS                            |
| <b>Large Commercial Facilities</b>                               |                            |                                 |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| 11. Sunset Doheny Hotel EIR                                      | S                          | S                               | N                       | N                      | LSM                 | LS                  | LS                            |
| 12. 2000 Avenue of Stars EIR                                     | LSM                        | LSM                             | NE                      | NE                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 13. Travelodge Hotel Project EIR                                 | S                          | LS                              | N                       | N                      | N                   | LS                  | LS                            |
| 14. Corbin and Nordoff Redevelopment Project EIR                 | LSM                        | LSM                             | NE                      | NE                     | NE                  | LS                  | NE                            |
| 15. Blvd 6200 Project EIR  | LSM                        | LS                              | NE                      | NE                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 16. Panorama Palace Project EIR                                  | S                          | LSM                             | N                       | N                      | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 17. Metro Universal Project EIR                                  | S                          | S                               | N                       | S                      | LS                  | S                   | LSM                           |

**TABLE 5.17-1 (Continued)**  
**Transportation/Traffic Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant                                       | N – No impacts                  |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation                      |                                 |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed | Significance Determination      |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
|  | a) Increase in Traffic          | b) Level of Service Standard | c) Air Traffic Patterns | d) Increase of Hazards | e) Emergency access | f) Parking Capacity | g) Alternative Transportation |
| 18. Paseo Plaza Hollywood Project EIR                            | S                               | LS                           | NE                      | NE                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 19. Plaza at the Glen Project EIR                                | S                               | LS                           | NE                      | LS                     | NE                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| <b>Entertainment/Recreational Facilities</b>                     |                                 |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| 20. City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) EIR           | S                               | S                            | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 21. LA Live -Sports and Entertainment District EIR               | S                               | S                            | LS                      | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 22. Canyon Hills Project EIR                                     | LSM                             | LS                           | NE                      | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | N                             |
| 23. Wilmington Waterfront Development Project EIR                | LSM                             | LS                           | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| <b>Institutional Facilities</b>                                  |                                 |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| 24. Caltrans District 7 Headquarters EIR                         | LSM                             | LS                           | N                       | N                      | LS                  | LS                  | N                             |
| 25. Buckley School Enhancement Project EIR                       | S                               | LS                           | N                       | N                      | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 26. Cedars Sinai West Tower Supplemental EIR                     | S                               | LS                           | NE                      | LS                     | LSM                 | LS                  | LS                            |
| 27. La Cienega Eldercare Facility Project EIR                    | LS                              | LS                           | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 28. Museum of Tolerance Project EIR                              | S                               | LS                           | N                       | N                      | N                   | LSM                 | LS                            |
| 29. New Paradise Church Project EIR                              | LSM                             | LS                           | N                       | LS                     | N                   | N                   | N                             |
| 30. Occidental College Specific Plan EIR                         | LSM                             | LS                           | LS                      | LS                     | LS                  | LSM                 | N                             |
| 31. Stephen Wise Middle School Relocation EIR                    | LSM                             | LS                           | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | NE                            |
| 32. Temple Israel of Hollywood EIR                               | LS                              | LS                           | NE                      | NE                     | N                   | N                   | NE                            |
| 33. USC Health Sciences Campus EIR                               | LSM                             | LS                           | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 34. Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School Project EIR            | S                               | LS                           | NE                      | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |

**TABLE 5.17-1 (Continued)**  
**Transportation/Traffic Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

| S – Significant  | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup> |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| LS – Less-than-Significant   | N – No impacts                  |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation  |                                 |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed                             | Significance Determination      |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
|  | a) Increase in Traffic          | b) Level of Service Standard | c) Air Traffic Patterns | d) Increase of Hazards | e) Emergency access | f) Parking Capacity | g) Alternative Transportation |
| 35. West LA College EIR  | S                               | LS                           | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| 36. City of Long Beach Fire Station Neg. Dec.  | LS                              | LS                           | N                       | LS                     | N                   | LS                  | N                             |
| 37. Harvard – Westlake School EIR  | S                               | LS                           | NE                      | LS                     | LS                  | LSM                 | LS                            |
| 38. County of Orange South Courthouse Facility EIR   | LS                              | LS                           | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | LS                  | LS                            |
| <b>Transportation Facilities</b>   |                                 |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| 39. TraPac Terminal Expansion at Berths 136-147 EIR  | LSM                             | LS                           | N                       | NE                     | LS                  | NE                  | LS                            |
| 40. Metro West Los Angeles Transportation Facility and Sunset Avenue Project EIR             | LSM                             | LSM                          | N                       | LSM                    | N                   | LS                  | N                             |
| 41. Canoga Park Orange Line Extension EIR  | LSM                             | LSM                          | NE                      | NE                     | LS                  | LSM                 | LS/Beneficial impacts         |
| <b>Utility Projects</b>  |                                 |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| 42. El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project (CEC approved)—Improved Power Generating Facility | LSM                             | LSM                          | LSM                     | LSM                    | NE                  | LSM                 | NE                            |
| 43. LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modifications Project EIR                           | LS                              | LS                           | N                       | S                      | N                   | N                   | N                             |
| 44. Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center EIR  | LSM                             | LS                           | N                       | N                      | LS                  | LS                  | N                             |
| 45. Joshua Basin Water District Recharge Basin and Pipeline Project EIR                      | LSM                             | N                            | N                       | N                      | LS                  | LS                  | N                             |
| <b>Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities</b>   |                                 |                              |                         |                        |                     |                     |                               |
| 46. Lantana Studio Development Project EIR   | S                               | S                            | N                       | LSM                    | N                   | LSM                 | N                             |
| 47. Alessandro Business Center Project EIR   | LSM                             | LSM                          | N                       | LS                     | LS                  | N                   | N                             |

**TABLE 5.17-1 (Concluded)**  
**Transportation/Traffic Impact Determination in Selected Environmental Documentation**

|   |                                   |                                     |                                |                               |                            |                            |                                      |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| S – Significant   |                                   | NE – Not Evaluated <sup>a</sup>     |                                |                               |                            |                            |                                      |
| LS – Less-than-Significant  |                                   | N – No impacts                      |                                |                               |                            |                            |                                      |
| LSM – Less-than-Significant with Mitigation   |                                   |                                     |                                |                               |                            |                            |                                      |
| <b>Environmental Documents for Primary Facility Categories Reviewed</b>   | <b>Significance Determination</b> |                                     |                                |                               |                            |                            |                                      |
|   | <b>a) Increase in Traffic</b>     | <b>b) Level of Service Standard</b> | <b>c) Air Traffic Patterns</b> | <b>d) Increase of Hazards</b> | <b>e) Emergency access</b> | <b>f) Parking Capacity</b> | <b>g) Alternative Transportation</b> |
| 48. City of San Dimas Costco Development Project EIR  | S                                 | S                                   | NE                             | LS                            | LS                         | LS                         | NE                                   |
| 49. 959 Seward Street Project EIR   | S                                 | LS                                  | NE                             | NE                            | N                          | N                          | NE                                   |
| <b>Heavy Industrial Facilities</b>  |                                   |                                     |                                |                               |                            |                            |                                      |
| 50. Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization Project EIR   | S                                 | LS                                  | N                              | N                             | N                          | S                          | N                                    |
| 51. SRG Chino South Industrial Park Project EIR   | LSM                               | LSM                                 | N                              | LS                            | N                          | N                          | LSM                                  |
| 52. Conoco Phillips Los Angeles Refinery Tank Replacement Project Neg. Dec.   | LS                                | LS                                  | N                              | N                             | N                          | N                          | N                                    |
| <sup>a</sup> An “NE” designation could mean one of the following:<br>1. The issue area was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>2. The specific checklist question was not discussed in the environmental document.<br>Source: ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009. |                                   |                                     |                                |                               |                            |                            |                                      |

of levels of service established for streets and highways. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts resulting in substantial increase in traffic and exceedance of level of service anywhere within the district.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from substantial increase in traffic over existing conditions and exceedance of level of service established for streets and highways from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) Change Air Traffic Patterns.** One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed no impacts on air traffic patterns; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. The individual project could be located within two miles of any airport or included in an airport land use plan.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Increased Hazards due to Design Feature or Incompatible Uses.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category indicated that for one of the projects, the environmental impacts related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses were less-than-significant. However, for the other project surveyed (Project #1 – Clos de la Tech Winery), the lead agency concluded that this agricultural project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts on safety risk associated with conflicts between vehicles on area roads. More specifically, although the increase in traffic attributed to this project was not considered substantial, the potential for conflict between vehicles exiting the site access road and turning left and vehicles traveling north on the main highway would increase to significant adverse levels, particularly during periods of poor visibility, such as fog or rain. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or

near a land use or incorporate design features that could create significant adverse impacts, including vehicular/bicycle or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, as well as operational delays caused by slowing and/or queuing to access a project site.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project, the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, and the additional considerations identified in the preceding paragraph, impacts related to increased hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Emergency Access.** The two CEQA documents for past projects in the agricultural facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to emergency access. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have a project driveway on a sidewalk with high pedestrian activity, or access risks or deficiencies associated with the adjoining street system due to curves, slopes, walls or other barriers to provide adequate lines-of-sight, or construction activities impeding access to the site.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency access from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) **Parking Capacity.** One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact on parking capacity; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on parking capacity. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on parking capacity of an area. Parking impacts can result from the provision of an insufficient parking supply to serve a project. Such impacts can be manifested by spillover of project parking demands onto nearby on-street or off-street parking facilities and could also result in project parking demand intrusion into nearby residential neighborhoods. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore,

impacts on parking capacity from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Conflict with Adopted Plans and Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation Systems.** One of the two CEQA documents for a past project in the agricultural facility category disclosed no impact on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 1 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system by increasing demand for transit ridership. Similarly, future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts could include design characteristics that could affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists or result in removal of sidewalks and bike routes. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Retail/Service Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 2,621 retail/service facilities, or 42.1 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of them would be established and operated within existing retail-oriented buildings in urban, commercial, and mixed-use residential areas.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include dry cleaning and laundry businesses, restaurants, gas stations, and auto repair facilities, as evidenced by the currently pending permits and permits issued by the SCAQMD in the five-year period. On a programmatic level, impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of constructing future new retail/services facilities may include potentially increasing traffic substantially over existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, exceed level of service standards for designated roads and highways, cause hazards due to design feature or through incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking capacity or emergency access, or conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation systems. Although retail/services facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for commercial uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to incompatible uses. These above-mentioned factors may result in significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for retail service facilities at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.17-1). The eight CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a medical office project, five mixed-use projects (all involving residential and retail developments), and two commercial/retail projects, illustrate the types of impacts that retail/services facilities would have on traffic and transportation, including substantial increase in daily and peak hour over existing traffic loads and capacity, exceedance of established level of service standards, inadequate parking capacity and access, and conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation system. Accordingly, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have some significant adverse impacts related to traffic and transportation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of traffic and transportation impacts identified in the eight CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Substantial Increase in Traffic over Existing Traffic Loads and Capacity and resulting in Exceedance of Established Levels of Service.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing traffic loads and capacity and exceedance of levels of service established for streets and highways were less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation). However, for the other projects surveyed (Projects #5 – Shops at Santa Anita Specific Plan, #7 – 2001 Main Street Mixed Use Development, #8 – 1427 Fourth Street, and #10 – New Century Plan), the lead agencies concluded that these retail/service projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing levels and exceedance of levels of service. More specifically, the impacts would result from the addition of new project-generated traffic to local intersections. In situations where a project involves street vacations or other substantial street system changes, traffic impacts were also determined to result from diverted or shifted traffic caused by the project. In addition, the increase in daily and peak hour traffic could result in the congestion of intersections and roads leading to excessive delays and queuing, increasing volume-to-capacity ratios, and exceedance of established level of service. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts resulting in substantial increase in traffic and exceedance of level of service anywhere within the district.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts from substantial increase in traffic over existing conditions and exceedance of level of service established for streets and highways from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c) Change Air Traffic Patterns.** Four of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed no impacts on air traffic patterns; the

other four CEQA documents did not address impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. The individual project could be located within two miles of any airport or included in an airport land use plan.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Increased Hazards due to Design Feature or Incompatible Uses.** Six of the eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses; the other two documents did not discuss impacts related to hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a land use or incorporate design features that could create significant adverse impacts, including vehicular/vehicular, vehicular/bicycle, or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, as well as operational delays caused by slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through the placement of project driveways in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or in close proximity to busy or congested intersections.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to increased hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) Emergency Access.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to emergency access. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have a project driveway on a sidewalk with high pedestrian activity, or access risks or deficiencies associated with the adjoining street system due to curves, slopes,

walls or other barriers to provide adequate lines-of-sight, or construction activities impeding access to the site.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency access from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Parking Capacity.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on parking capacity. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on parking capacity of an area. Parking impacts can result from the provision of an insufficient parking supply to serve a project. Such impacts can be manifested by spillover of project parking demands to nearby on-street or off-street parking facilities or project parking demand intrusion into nearby residential neighborhoods. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on parking capacity from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Conflict with Adopted Plans and Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation Systems.** The eight CEQA documents for past projects in the retail/services facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 2 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system by increasing demand for transit ridership. Similarly, future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts could include design characteristics that could affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists or result in removal of sidewalks and bike routes. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Large Commercial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 649 large commercial facilities, or 10.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). However, based on these historical data and the assumption that the annual percentage of newly constructed physical activities would be five percent, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction since most of the projects would be established and operated within existing buildings and facilities in developed urban areas.

Examples of large commercial facilities that may be constructed in the future include hotels/motels, regional shopping centers, and office and media production facilities. On a programmatic level, impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of constructing future new large commercial facilities may include potentially increasing traffic substantially over existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, exceed level of service standards for designated roads and highways, cause hazards due to design feature or through incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking capacity or emergency access, or conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation systems. Although large commercial facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for commercial uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to incompatible uses. These above-mentioned factors may result in significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for large commercial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.17-1). The nine CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two hotel/motel projects, a regional shopping center, and six mixed-use projects (all involving commercial and residential developments), illustrate the types of impacts that large commercial facilities would have on traffic and transportation, including substantial increase in daily and peak hour over existing traffic loads and capacity, exceedance of established level of service standards, inadequate parking capacity and access, and conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation system. Accordingly, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have some significant adverse impacts related to traffic and transportation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of traffic and transportation impacts identified in the nine CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Substantial Increase in Traffic over Existing Traffic Loads and Capacity and resulting in Exceedance of Established Levels of Service.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for some of these projects, environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing traffic loads and capacities were less-than-significant (without

or with mitigation). However, for the other projects surveyed (Projects #11 – Sunset Doheny Hotel, #13 – Travelodge Hotel, #16 – Panorama Palace, #17 – Metro Universal, #18 – Paseo Plaza Hollywood, and #19 – Plaza at the Glen), the lead agencies concluded that these large commercial projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing levels. More specifically, the impacts would result from the addition of new project-generated traffic to local intersections. In situations where a project involves street vacations or other substantial street system changes, traffic impacts can also result from diverted or shifted traffic caused by the project. The increase in daily and peak hour traffic could result in the congestion of intersections and roads leading to excessive delays and queuing, increasing volume-to-capacity ratios and exceedance of established level of service. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts resulting in substantial increase in traffic and exceedance of level of service anywhere within the district.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts from substantial increase in traffic over existing conditions and exceedance of level of service established for streets and highways from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Change Air Traffic Patterns.** Four of the nine CEQA documents for past project in the large commercial facility category disclosed no impacts on air traffic patterns; the other five CEQA documents did not address impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. The individual project could be located within two miles of any airport or included in an airport land use plan.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Increased Hazards due to Design Feature or Incompatible Uses.** The nine CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses were either less-than-significant or no impact; four of the CEQA documents did not discuss impacts related to hazards

due to design features or incompatible land uses). However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #17 – Metro Universal), the lead agency concluded that this large commercial project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses. More specifically, sidewalk closures were proposed for this project throughout the construction phase, requiring some pedestrians in the area to cross over streets in order to access a sidewalk, potentially causing an increase in vehicle/pedestrian interaction to create a significant adverse impact on pedestrian safety. Similarly, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a land use or incorporate design features that could create significant adverse impacts, including vehicular/vehicular, vehicular/bicycle conflicts, as well as operational delays caused by slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through the placement of project driveways in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or in close proximity to busy or congested intersections.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to increased hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Emergency Access.** Seven of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact related to emergency access; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to emergency access. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have a project driveway on a sidewalk with high pedestrian activity, or access risks or deficiencies associated with the adjoining street system due to curves, slopes, walls or other barriers to provide adequate lines-of-sight, or construction activities impeding access to the site.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency access from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) **Parking Capacity.** The nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental

impacts on parking capacity were concluded to be less-than-significant. However, for one project surveyed (Project #17 – Metro Universal), the lead agency concluded that this large commercial project has the potential to generate significant adverse impacts due to insufficient parking capacity as a result of that project. Furthermore, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on parking capacity of an area. Parking impacts can result from the provision of an insufficient parking supply to serve a project. Such impacts can be manifested by spillover of project parking demands to nearby on-street or off-street parking facilities or project parking demand intrusion into nearby residential neighborhoods. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on parking capacity from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Conflict with Adopted Plans and Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation Systems.** Eight of the nine CEQA documents for past projects in the large commercial facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system; the other CEQA document did not include discussion on impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 3 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system by increasing demand for transit ridership. Similarly, future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD's internal accounts could include design characteristics that could affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists or result in removal of sidewalks and bike routes. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Entertainment/Recreational Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 24 entertainment/recreational facilities, or less than one percent of the total (see Table

5.0-1). Accordingly, based on these historical data, a small number of these new entertainment and recreation-oriented facilities is anticipated to be developed in the future.

Examples of projects that may be constructed in the future include sports venues, concert halls, parks, golf courses, equestrian centers, and other outdoor recreational facilities. On a programmatic level, impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of constructing future new entertainment/recreational facilities may include potentially increasing traffic substantially over existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, exceed level of service standards for designated roads and highways, cause hazards due to design feature or through incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking capacity or emergency access, or conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation systems. Although entertainment/recreational facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for commercial and recreational uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to incompatible uses. These above-mentioned factors may result in significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for entertainment/recreational facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.17-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for the development of a professional football stadium in the City of Industry, a sports and entertainment district in downtown Los Angeles, a residential project with an equestrian center and a large open space component in the San Fernando Valley, and a waterfront project in the Community of Wilmington in the South Bay, illustrate the types of impacts that entertainment and recreational facilities would have on traffic and transportation, including substantial increase in daily and peak hour over existing traffic loads and capacity, exceedance of established level of service standards, inadequate parking capacity and access, and conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation system. Accordingly, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have significant adverse impacts related to traffic and transportation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of traffic and transportation impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Substantial Increase in Traffic over Existing Traffic Loads and Capacity and resulting in Exceedance of Established Levels of Service.** The four CEQA documents prepared for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category indicated that for some of the project surveyed, environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing traffic loads and capacity or exceedance of established levels of service were considered to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for two of the projects surveyed (Projects #20 – City of Industry Business Center (NFL Stadium) and #21 – LA Live-Sports and Entertainment District), the lead agencies concluded that these entertainment/recreational projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing levels or exceedance of established levels of service. More specifically, the impacts would result from the addition of new project-generated traffic to local intersections during events at these venues. In situations where a project involves street vacations or other substantial

street system changes, traffic impacts can also result from diverted or shifted traffic caused by the project. The increase in daily and peak hour traffic could result in the congestion of intersections and roads leading to excessive delays and queuing, increasing volume-to-capacity ratios and exceedance of established level of service. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts resulting in substantial increase in traffic and exceedance of level of service anywhere within the district.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts from substantial increase in traffic over existing conditions and exceedance of level of service established for streets and highways from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Change Air Traffic Patterns.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past project in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts on air traffic patterns; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. The individual project could be located within two miles of any airport or included in an airport land use plan.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Increased Hazards due to Design Feature or Incompatible Uses.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a land use or incorporate design features that could create significant adverse impacts, including vehicular/vehicular, vehicular/bicycle, or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, as well as operational delays caused by slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through

the placement of project driveways in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or in close proximity to busy or congested intersections.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to increased hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Emergency Access.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts related to emergency access. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have a project driveway on a sidewalk with high pedestrian activity, or access risks or deficiencies associated with the adjoining street system due to curves, slopes, walls or other barriers to provide adequate lines-of-sight, or construction activities impeding access to the site.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency access from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) **Parking Capacity.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts on parking capacity. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on parking capacity of an area. Parking impacts can result from the provision of an insufficient parking supply to serve a project. Such impacts can be manifested by spillover of project parking demands to nearby on-street or off-street parking facilities and project parking demand intrusion into nearby residential neighborhoods. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on parking capacity from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Conflict with Adopted Plans and Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation Systems.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the entertainment/recreational facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 4 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system by increasing demand for transit ridership. Similarly, future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts could include design characteristics that could affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists or result in removal of sidewalks and bike routes. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

#### **Institutional Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 421 institutional facilities, or 6.8 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most would be located within existing buildings in commercial, residential, and institutional land use areas.

Examples of institutional facilities include schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, and churches/temple. On a programmatic level, impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of constructing future new institutional facilities may include potentially increasing traffic substantially over existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, exceed level of service standards for designated roads and highways, cause hazards due to design feature or through incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking capacity or emergency access, or conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation systems. Although institutional facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for commercial, residential, and institutional uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to incompatible uses. These above-mentioned factors may result in significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, etc., available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.17-1). The 15 CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a state agency headquarters, a county courthouse facility, four schools, two colleges, an addition to an existing university campus, an addition to an existing hospital, an eldercare facility, a

museum, two religious facilities, and a fire station, illustrate the types of impacts that institutional facilities would have on traffic and transportation, including substantial increase in daily and peak hour over existing traffic loads and capacity, exceedance of established level of service standards, inadequate parking capacity and access, and conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation system. Accordingly, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have some significant adverse impacts related to traffic and transportation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of traffic and transportation impacts identified in the 15 CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Substantial Increase in Traffic over Existing Traffic Loads and Capacity and resulting in Exceedance of Established Levels of Service.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category indicated that for some projects, environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing traffic loads and capacity were concluded to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for six of the projects surveyed (Projects #25 – Buckley School Enhancement, #26 – Cedars Sinai West Tower, #28 – Museum of Tolerance, #34 – Sierra Canyon Senior Secondary School, #35 – West LA College, and #37 – Harvard – Westlake School), the lead agencies concluded that these institutional projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing levels. More specifically, the impacts would result from the addition of new project-generated traffic to local intersections. In situations where a project involves street vacations or other substantial street system changes, traffic impacts can also result from diverted or shifted traffic caused by the project. The increase in daily and peak hour traffic could result in the congestion of intersections and roads leading to excessive delays and queuing, increasing volume-to-capacity ratios, and exceedance of established level of service. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts resulting in substantial increase in traffic and exceedance of level of service anywhere within the district.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts from substantial increase in traffic over existing conditions and exceedance of level of service established for streets and highways from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c) Change Air Traffic Patterns.** 11 of the 15 CEQA documents for past project in the institutional facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts on air traffic patterns; the other four CEQA documents did not address impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5

in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. The individual project could be located within two miles of any airport or included in an airport land use plan.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Increased Hazards due to Design Feature or Incompatible Uses.** 14 of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts related to hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a land use or incorporate design features that could create significant adverse impacts, including vehicular/vehicular, vehicular/bicycle, or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, as well as operational delays caused by slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through the placement of project driveways in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or in close proximity to busy or congested intersections.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to increased hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) Emergency Access.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts related to emergency access. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have a project driveway on a sidewalk with high pedestrian activity, or access risks or deficiencies associated with the adjoining street system due to curves, slopes, walls or other barriers to provide adequate lines-of-sight, or construction activities impeding access to the site.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency access from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Parking Capacity.** The 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts on parking capacity. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on parking capacity of an area. Parking impacts can result from the provision of an insufficient parking supply to serve a project. Such impacts can be manifested by spillover of project parking demands to nearby on-street or off-street parking facilities and project parking demand intrusion into nearby residential neighborhoods. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on parking capacity from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Conflict with Adopted Plans and Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation Systems.** 13 of the 15 CEQA documents for past projects in the institutional facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 5 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system by increasing demand for transit ridership. Similarly, future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts could include design characteristics that could affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists or result in removal of sidewalks and bike routes. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different

environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Transportation Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 100 transportation facilities, or 1.6 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Due to continuing improvements in transportation facilities across the district to accommodate expected increases in goods movement, it is possible that a larger number of transportation-related facilities would be constructed in the future due to continuing improvements and expansion of public transportation infrastructure. However, since highways and roads typically do not require stationary source permits, the number of transportation-related facilities that would require such permits in the future does not constitute a large number (based on historical data, as shown in Table 5.0-1) in comparison to the overall SCAQMD permitting activities.

Examples of transportation facilities that may be constructed in the future include port terminal expansions, transit/bus maintenance facilities, and transit lines and transit line extensions. On a programmatic level, impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of constructing future new transportation facilities may include potentially increasing traffic substantially over existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, exceed level of service standards for designated roads and highways, cause hazards due to design feature or through incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking capacity or emergency access, or conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation systems. Although transportation facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for mixed use, commercial and industrial uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to incompatible uses. These above-mentioned factors may result in significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the selected CEQA documents for transportation facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.17-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for a port terminal expansion, a bus maintenance facility, and a transit line extension, illustrate the types of impacts that transportation projects would have on traffic and transportation, including substantial increase in daily and peak hour over existing traffic loads and capacity, exceedance of established level of service standards, inadequate parking capacity and access, and conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation system. Accordingly, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have some significant adverse impacts (prior to mitigation) related to traffic and transportation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of traffic and transportation impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Substantial Increase in Traffic over Existing Traffic Loads and Capacity and resulting in Exceedance of Established Levels of Service.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing traffic loads and capacity and exceedance of levels of service

established for streets and highways. More specifically, the impacts would result from the addition of new project-generated traffic to local intersections. In situations where a project involves street vacations or other substantial street system changes, traffic impacts can also result from diverted or shifted traffic caused by the project. The increase in daily and peak hour traffic could result in the congestion of intersections and roads leading to excessive delays and queuing, increasing volume-to-capacity ratios and exceedance of established level of service. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts resulting in substantial increase in traffic and exceedance of level of service anywhere within the district.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from substantial increase in traffic over existing conditions and exceedance of level of service established for streets and highways from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Change Air Traffic Patterns.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed no impacts on air traffic patterns; the other CEQA document did not address impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. The individual project could be located within two miles of any airport or included in an airport land use plan.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Increased Hazards due to Design Feature or Incompatible Uses.** One of the three CEQA documents for a past project in the transportation facility category disclosed a less-than-significant impact with implementation of mitigation measures related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses; the other two CEQA documents did not discuss impacts related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a land

use or incorporate design features that could create significant adverse impacts, including vehicular/vehicular, vehicular/bicycle, or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, as well as operational delays caused by slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through the placement of project driveways in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or in close proximity to busy or congested intersections.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to increased hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Emergency Access.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to emergency access. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have a project driveway on a sidewalk with high pedestrian activity, or access risks or deficiencies associated with the adjoining street system due to curves, slopes, walls or other barriers to provide adequate lines-of-sight, or construction activities impeding access to the site.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency access from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) **Parking Capacity.** Two of the three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) on parking capacity; the other CEQA document did not address impacts on parking capacity. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on parking capacity of an area. Parking impacts can result from the provision of an insufficient parking supply to serve a project. Such impacts can be manifested by spillover of project parking demands to nearby on-street or off-street parking facilities and project parking demand intrusion into nearby residential neighborhoods. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on parking capacity from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Conflict with Adopted Plans and Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation Systems.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the transportation facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 6 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system by increasing demand for transit ridership. Similarly, future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts could include design characteristics that could affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists or result in removal of sidewalks and bike routes. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Utility Projects**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 150 utility facilities, or 2.4 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on this historical data, a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed and operated in the future. On a programmatic level, those new utility-oriented facilities that may be constructed in the future could involve water treatment plants (e.g., tanks, digesters, ponds), above- and underground pipelines, power generating equipment (e.g., boilers, fuel-storage, exhaust structures), and landfill processing, transport, and storage facilities. Some types of future utility projects may require demolition of existing structures and construction of low- to medium-scale buildings.

While a large number of new utility-oriented facilities is not anticipated to be constructed in the future, alteration, upgrades and improvement of existing facilities are likely to occur in order to meet additional future demand for public utility infrastructure. Due to the necessity of many public infrastructure and utility services, these facilities have the potential to be constructed in a wide range of different areas. On a programmatic level, impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of constructing future new utility facilities may include potentially increasing traffic substantially over existing traffic load and

capacity of the street system, exceed level of service standards for designated roads and highways, cause hazards due to design feature or through incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking capacity or emergency access, or conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation systems. Although utility facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for industrial uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to incompatible uses. These above-mentioned factors may result in significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for utility projects available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.17-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to an existing power generating facilities, a landfill and recycling center, and a recharge basin and pipeline project, illustrate the types of impacts that utility projects would have traffic and transportation, including substantial increase in daily and peak hour over existing traffic loads and capacity, exceedance of established level of service standards, inadequate parking capacity and access, and conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation system. Accordingly, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have some significant adverse impacts related to traffic and transportation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of traffic and transportation impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Substantial Increase in Traffic over Existing Traffic Loads and Capacity and resulting in Exceedance of Established Levels of Service.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing traffic loads and capacity and exceedance of levels of service established for streets and highways. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts resulting in substantial increase in traffic and exceedance of level of service anywhere within the district.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts from substantial increase in traffic over existing conditions and exceedance of level of service established for streets and highways from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

**c) Change Air Traffic Patterns.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impact with implementation of mitigation measures or no impacts on air traffic patterns. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future

individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. The individual project could be located within two miles of any airport or included in an airport land use plan.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) Increased Hazards due to Design Feature or Incompatible Uses.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts were concluded to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures or no impacts related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses. However, for one project surveyed (Project #43 – LADWP Electrical Generating Stations Modification), the lead agency concluded that this utility project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the possibility of an accidental spill of chemicals resulting from truck accidents. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a land use or incorporate design features that could create significant adverse impacts, including vehicular/vehicular, vehicular/bicycle, or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, as well as operational delays caused by slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through the placement of project driveways in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or in close proximity to busy or congested intersections.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to increased hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) Emergency Access.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impact related to emergency access; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts related emergency access. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have a project driveway on a sidewalk with high pedestrian activity, or access risks or deficiencies associated with the adjoining street system due to curves, slopes, walls or other

barriers to provide adequate lines-of-sight, or construction activities impeding access to the site.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency access from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Parking Capacity.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impact on parking capacity. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on parking capacity of an area. Parking impacts can result from the provision of an insufficient parking supply to serve a project. Such impacts can be manifested by spillover of project parking demands to nearby on-street or off-street parking facilities and project parking demand intrusion into nearby residential neighborhoods. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on parking capacity from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Conflict with Adopted Plans and Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation Systems.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the utility facility category disclosed no impact on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system; the other CEQA document did not discuss impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 7 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system by increasing demand for transit ridership. Similarly, future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts could include design characteristics that could affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists or result in removal of sidewalks and bike routes. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Light Industrial/Warehouse Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,133 light industrial/warehouse facilities, or 18.2 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing buildings, structures, and warehouses in industrial or other compatibly zoned areas.

Examples of light industrial/warehouse facilities that may be constructed include production/post-production studios/facilities, business parks housing light industrial and warehouse distribution uses, and a warehouse/retail facility. On a programmatic level, impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of constructing future new light industrial/warehouse facilities may include potentially increasing traffic substantially over existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, exceed level of service standards for designated roads and highways, cause hazards due to design feature or through incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking capacity or emergency access, or conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation systems. Although light industrial/warehouse facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for commercial uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to incompatible uses. These above-mentioned factors may result in significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for light industry/warehouse facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.17-1). The four CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for two production/post-production studios/facilities, a business park, and a warehouse/retail facility, illustrate the types of impacts that light industrial/warehouse projects would have traffic and transportation, including substantial increase in daily and peak hour over existing traffic loads and capacity, exceedance of established level of service standards, inadequate parking capacity and access, and conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation system. Accordingly, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have significant adverse impacts related to traffic and transportation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of traffic and transportation impacts identified in the four CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Substantial Increase in Traffic over Existing Traffic Loads and Capacity and resulting in Exceedance of Established Levels of Service.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category indicated that for some of the projects, environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing traffic loads and capacity were concluded

to be less-than-significant (without or with mitigation). However, for most of the projects surveyed, the lead agencies concluded that the light industrial/warehouse projects have the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing levels, such as those disclosed for Projects #46 – Lantana Studio Development, #48 – City of San Dimas Costco Development, and #49 – 959 Seward Street. More specifically, the impacts would result from the addition of new project-generated traffic to local intersections. In situations where a project involves street vacations or other substantial street system changes, traffic impacts can also result from diverted or shifted traffic caused by the project. The increase in daily and peak hour traffic could result in the congestion of intersections and roads leading to excessive delays and queuing, increasing volume-to-capacity ratios and exceedance of established level of service. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts resulting in substantial increase in traffic and exceedance of level of service anywhere within the district.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts from substantial increase in traffic over existing conditions and exceedance of level of service established for streets and highways from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Change Air Traffic Patterns.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed no impacts on air traffic patterns; the other two CEQA documents did not address impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. The individual project could be located within two miles of any airport or included in an airport land use plan.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Increased Hazards due to Design Feature or Incompatible Uses.** Three of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses; the other CEQA

document did not discuss impacts related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a land use or incorporate design features that could create significant adverse impacts, including vehicular/vehicular, vehicular/bicycle, or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, as well as operational delays caused by slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through the placement of project driveways in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or in close proximity to busy or congested intersections.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to increased hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Emergency Access.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts related to emergency access. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have a project driveway on a sidewalk with high pedestrian activity, or access risks or deficiencies associated with the adjoining street system due to curves, slopes, walls or other barriers to provide adequate lines-of-sight, or construction activities impeding access to the site.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency access from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) **Parking Capacity.** The four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed either less-than-significant impacts (without or with mitigation) or no impacts on parking capacity. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on parking capacity of an area. Parking impacts can result from the provision of an insufficient parking supply to serve a project. Such impacts can be manifested by spillover of project parking demands to nearby on-street or off-street parking facilities and project parking

demand intrusion into nearby residential neighborhoods. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on parking capacity from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Conflict with Adopted Plans and Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation Systems.** Two of the four CEQA documents for past projects in the light industrial/warehouse facility category disclosed no impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system; the other two CEQA documents did not discuss impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 8 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system by increasing demand for transit ridership. Similarly, future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts could include design characteristics that could affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists or result in removal of sidewalks and bike routes. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Heavy Industrial Facilities**

Review of approved and pending permit applications over the five-year period identified 1,118 heavy industrial facilities, or 17.9 percent of the total (see Table 5.0-1). Based on these historical data, only some of these heavy industrial facilities are anticipated to involve new construction in the future since most of them would be located within existing structures in industrial zoned areas.

Examples of heavy industrial facilities that may be constructed include refineries and industrial parks. On a programmatic level, impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of constructing future new heavy industrial facilities may include potentially increasing traffic substantially over existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, exceed level of service standards for designated roads and highways, cause hazards due to design feature or through incompatible uses, result in inadequate parking capacity or emergency

access, or conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation systems. Although heavy industrial facilities would most likely be constructed in areas zoned for commercial uses, these facilities may be near or directly adjacent to incompatible uses. These above-mentioned factors may result in significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts.

Project-specific impacts are identified in the CEQA documents for heavy industrial facilities available at the time the survey was conducted (see Table 5.17-1). The three CEQA documents surveyed, which were prepared for improvements to two existing refineries and an industrial park project, illustrate the types of impacts that heavy industrial projects would have on traffic and transportation, including substantial increase in daily and peak hour over existing traffic loads and capacity, exceedance of established level of service standards, inadequate parking capacity and access, and conflict with adopted plans and policies for alternative transportation system. Accordingly, these projects were found in the CEQA documents surveyed to have significant adverse impacts related to traffic and transportation. More specifically, the following discussions provide an overall summary of the types of traffic and transportation impacts identified in the three CEQA documents surveyed.

**a, b) Substantial Increase in Traffic over Existing Traffic Loads and Capacity and resulting in Exceedance of Established Levels of Service.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category indicated that for most of the projects, environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing traffic loads and capacity were concluded to be less-than-significant impact (without or with mitigation). However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #50 – Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization), the lead agency concluded that this heavy industrial project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the substantial increase in traffic over existing levels. More specifically, the impacts would result from the addition of new project-generated traffic to local intersections. The increase in daily and peak hour traffic could result in the congestion of intersections and roads leading to excessive delays and queuing, increasing volume-to-capacity ratios and exceedance of established level of service. In addition, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts resulting in substantial increase in traffic and exceedance of level of service anywhere within the district.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts from substantial increase in traffic over existing conditions and exceedance of level of service established for streets and highways from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- c) **Change Air Traffic Patterns.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed no impacts on air traffic patterns. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns. The individual project could be located within two miles of any airport or included in an airport land use plan.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- d) **Increased Hazards due to Design Feature or Incompatible Uses.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact or no impacts related to increased hazards from design features or incompatible uses. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could be sited in or near a land use or incorporate design features that could create significant adverse impacts, including vehicular/vehicular, vehicular/bicycle, or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, as well as operational delays caused by slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through the placement of project driveways in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or in close proximity to busy or congested intersections.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a "snapshot" of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts related to increased hazards due to design features or incompatible land uses from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- e) **Emergency Access.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed no impacts related to emergency access. However, based on SCAQMD staff's review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD's offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could have a project driveway on a sidewalk with high pedestrian activity, or access risks or deficiencies associated with the adjoining street system due to curves, slopes, walls or other barriers to provide adequate lines-of-sight, or construction activities impeding access to the site.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on emergency access from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- f) Parking Capacity.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category indicated that for most of the projects, no impacts related to the parking capacity would occur. However, for one of the projects surveyed (Project #50 – Chevron Products Company El Segundo Refinery Product Reliability and Optimization), the lead agency concluded that this heavy industrial project has the potential to generate significant adverse environmental impacts related to the deficiency in parking capacity at the project site during project construction. Based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on parking capacity of an area. Parking impacts can result from the provision of an insufficient parking supply to serve a project. Such impacts can be manifested by spillover of project parking demands to nearby on-street or off-street parking facilities and project parking demand intrusion into nearby residential neighborhoods. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Therefore, based on information in the CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project and the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts on parking capacity from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

- g) Conflict with Adopted Plans and Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation Systems.** The three CEQA documents for past projects in the heavy industrial facility category disclosed either a less-than-significant impact with implementation of mitigation measures or no impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system. However, based on SCAQMD staff’s review of the distribution of similar types of projects for this facility category that have obtained offsets from the SCAQMD’s offset accounts in the past (Figure 9 in Appendix F), it is possible that future individual projects in this facility category could create significant adverse impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system by increasing demand for transit ridership. Similarly, future facilities obtaining offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts could include design characteristics that could affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists or result in removal of sidewalks and bike routes. This could potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Based on the fact that the prior CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, with different types of future projects and in different environmental settings, transportation/traffic impacts could be significant. Therefore, impacts on programs and policies supporting alternative transportation system from implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Summary of Findings**

The review of 52 CEQA documents found that most of the past projects had environmental impacts related to traffic and transportation that were either less-than-significant or less-than-significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, review of the CEQA documents also found that some of the past projects have the potential to generate significant adverse impacts related to increased traffic (regionally and locally), increased hazards due to design features, or parking capacity. Therefore, based on information in the 52 CEQA documents evaluated for the proposed project that cover the nine primary facility categories, exercising SCAQMD staff’s independent judgment, and the fact that the CEQA documents evaluated provide only a “snapshot” of the documents for the applicable facility categories available at the time the analysis was prepared, impacts related to traffic and transportation as an indirect result of implementing the proposed project are determined to be significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA requires the evaluation of cumulative impacts in addition to direct and indirect impacts. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refer to the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a proposed project when added to other “past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects.” [14 Cal. Code Reg. 13355].

For the purposes of the proposed project, the assessment of cumulative impacts provided below includes the reasonably foreseeable impacts from the following types of facilities:

- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal offset accounts per Proposed Rule 1315 (i.e., Rules 1304 and 1309.1);
- Facilities that will obtain offsets on the open credit market;
- Facilities that will obtain offsets from the SCAQMD’s internal accounts per Senate Bill (SB) 827; and
- Power plant facilities per Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1318 (Perez), proposed SB 388 (Calderon), and potentially one other bill, which would require transfer of emission reduction credits for certain pollutants from SCAQMD’s internal offset accounts to eligible electrical generating facilities.

Facilities obtaining an SCAQMD air quality permit will be required to offset any increase in emissions either by obtaining offsets per Proposed Rule 1315, SB 827, or by obtaining

offsets on the open market. As noted in the discussion of the traffic and transportation settings (see Section 3.17), the regional transportation system in the district is currently operating at or above capacity during peak periods. The roadway system shows substantial freeway congestion in the morning and evening peak periods. The transit system is experiencing substantial overcrowding on a number of core urban bus routes with significant excess capacity on most off-peak and peripheral routes. While not all future development projects would result in significant traffic or transportation related impacts, as noted above, the evaluation of cumulative traffic and transportation impacts is uncertain since the specific location and impacts of individual facilities cannot be identified at this time.

However, future projects are likely to result in traffic impacts, which are similar to those from past development projects. Some of the past projects were determined to have significant adverse impacts on traffic and transportation, including the potential to (1) increase traffic substantially from existing conditions, (2) result in exceedance of levels of service for freeway segments and intersections established by congestion management agency, (3) result in increased hazards from design features or incompatible land uses, or (4) result in inadequate parking capacity.

It is reasonably foreseeable that the SCAQMD would be required to provide offsets to three power plants from the SCAQMD's internal accounts. The three power plant projects, NRG's El Segundo Power Redevelopment (El Segundo), Walnut Creek Energy Park (Walnut Creek), and CPV Sentinel Energy (Sentinel), were evaluated by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in separate Final Staff Assessments (FSAs), which were reviewed to obtain the environmental impact analysis and determination of significance made by the lead agency (CEC). The analysis and conclusions regarding significance are summarized and incorporated by reference herein. The El Segundo and Walnut Creek projects are located in Los Angeles County and the Sentinel project is located in Riverside County.

The CEC concluded in the FSAs for all three power plant projects that the projects would generate significant adverse transportation and traffic impacts but the impacts could be mitigated to less than significant. The FSA for the El Segundo projects notes the influx of large numbers of construction workers and the transportation of large pieces of equipment can, over the course of the construction phase, increase roadway congestion and also affect traffic flow. The FSA continues to state that the construction of other facilities such as pipelines for water service can temporarily disrupt traffic flows when trenching is required in or across roadways. The project proponent expected to add two new full-time employees above the current operations employee levels, which is an increase, the CEC concludes, that is insignificant in traffic levels. The FSA discloses that deliveries to the project site are expected for on-going maintenance of the plant and the incremental change in the number of delivery trips to the plant site is expected to be nominal and will generally occur during non-commute periods. Overall, the CEC staff determined that the intersections and roadways that are operating at acceptable level of service (LOS) (LOS of D or better) will not see a decline in their LOS to an unacceptable LOS but since some of the area intersections and roadways are operating at a LOS of "E" or "F" the potential exists for the project to cause an impact in the traffic and

transportation area. However, the CEC concluded that any identified transportation/traffic impacts can be mitigated to a level of insignificance by implementing the following mitigation measures: comply with Caltrans and other relevant jurisdictions limitations on vehicle sizes and weights; comply with Caltrans and other relevant jurisdictions limitations for encroachment into public rights-of-way and shall obtain necessary encroachment permits from Caltrans and all relevant jurisdictions; ensure that permits and/or licenses are secured from the California Highway Patrol and Caltrans for the transport of hazardous materials; develop a parking and staging plan for all phases of project construction to enforce a policy that all project-related parking occurs on-site or in designated off-site parking areas; consult with the Cities of El Segundo, Manhattan Beach and Los Angeles, and prepare and submit a construction traffic control plan to the construction project manager (CPM) for approval; have all the lighting and marking required by the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) so that the stacks do not create a hazard to air navigation; and repair any damage to the segment of Vista Del Mar and other roadways affected by construction activity along with the primary roadways.

CEC staff analyzed the traffic related information for the Walnut Creek Project and concluded the traffic and transportation impacts would be significant but that the availability of mitigation measures could reduce or eliminate the significance of these impacts. In addition, the CEC determined the mitigation measures would ensure that the project complies with applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) pertaining to traffic and transportation. According to the FSA for Walnut Creek, traffic and transportation impacts during construction will result from the vehicle trips of the construction workforce (e.g., boilermakers, electricians, ironworkers, carpenters); truck traffic generated by the demolition and removal of the existing warehouse on the proposed project site; and truck deliveries supplying construction materials and equipment. Operation of the Walnut Creek project will result in traffic and transportation impacts from employee trips, which, according to the FSA, will result in a tenfold reduction in total trip generation when compared to employee trips generated by the current warehouse operation and, therefore, result in a significant adverse impact to traffic and transportation. In addition, the CEC determined that truck trips during operation, including delivery of hazardous materials and removal of wastes, will be a maximum of three truck trips per day with an average of two or fewer trips per day, and concluded this number of truck trips would not significantly impact the existing LOS for area roads. According to the FSA, aircraft approaching or departing the El Monte Airport do not fly over the proposed power plant, and the proposed facility is not located within 20,000 feet of a runway at the El Monte Airport, or other general aviation facility. Significant traffic and transportation impacts during construction are mitigated to less than significant with the following measures listed in the FSA: secure an encroachment permit demonstrating compliance with the applicable requirements of the City of Industry, the County of Los Angeles, and Caltrans; comply with the applicable parking standards of the City of Industry, and the County of Los Angeles; prepare a parking plan(s) for the construction and operation phases of the project and submit to the CPM for approval a parking plan(s) for the construction and operation phases of the project; prepare a construction traffic control and implementation plan for the project and its associated facilities; repair to original or near original condition affected public rights-of-way; and submit written notification to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Aero Bureau informing them of the start of commercial operation date for the power plant and advising them that potential turbulence caused by thermal plumes emitted from the power plant's cooling towers and combustion turbine generator stacks may adversely affect aircraft flying directly over the power plant below an elevation of 500 feet above ground level.

The FSA prepared by the CEC for the Sentinel project employee trips from construction workforce and truck delivery for construction material and equipment have the potential to generate significant transportation/traffic impacts as the LOS is degraded in both intersections and freeway ramps resulting in motorists experiencing an increased delay. The operation of the Sentinel project would employ ten full-time and four part-time workers spread over a 24-hour period in addition to an estimated one to two nonrecurring service/delivery trips per month to and from the project site. Further, the FSA states that tanker trucks delivering aqueous ammonia to replenish aqueous ammonia stored on site for plant operation will occur up to 56 times per year from a supplier in Southern California. The FSA determined the project site is not located within 20,000 feet of an airport runway triggering a notification to the FAA and does not have any structure exceeding 200 feet in height which would also trigger an FAA notification. The CEC concluded that the construction and operation of the Sentinel project with the effective implementation of the following mitigation measures would ensure that the project's direct adverse traffic and transportation impacts are less than significant and, ensure that the Sentinel project complies with applicable LORS regarding traffic and transportation: secure an encroachment permit in accordance with the applicable requirements of the county of Riverside, the city of Palm Springs, and Caltrans; comply with the applicable parking standards of the county of Riverside; prepare a parking plan for the operation phase of the project and submit to the CPM for approval; prepare a construction traffic control and implementation plan, including timing of heavy equipment and building materials deliveries, signing, lighting, and traffic control device placement, and redirecting construction traffic for the project and its associated facilities; repair affected public rights-of-way (e.g., highway, road, bicycle path, pedestrian path) to original or near original condition that has been damaged due to construction activities conducted for the project and its associated facilities; dedicate, and complete improvement of Melissa Lane from Dillon Road to the north boundary of the Sentinel site to the county of Riverside standard for a collector rural road; and pay a Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee to the county of Riverside;

Based upon the above considerations, impacts of the project are considered to be cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)) and the proposed project has the potential to contribute to significant adverse cumulative transportation/traffic impacts.

### **Mitigation Measures for Future Traffic and Transportation Impacts**

Mitigation measures were described in the CEQA documents that were surveyed relating to any potentially significant traffic and transportation impacts identified in those documents. As a single purpose public agency responsible for adopting and enforcing

air quality rules and regulations, the SCAQMD's authority to implement mitigation measures for such indirect impacts is limited. CEQA is intended to be implemented in conjunction with discretionary powers granted to public agencies by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §14040(a)). Further, the CEQA Guidelines (§15040(b)) specifically state, "CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws." With respect to measures identified in the survey for mitigation of potentially significant adverse traffic and transportation impacts, no mitigation measures were identified that are within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD to implement. In addition, because the survey related to representative facilities, rather than to specific future facilities that will actually receive permits from SCAQMD, it is not feasible to identify appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures for traffic and transportation impacts in this PEA. Instead, appropriate facility-specific mitigation measures will necessarily have to be identified in the CEQA document prepared for each such facility that is proposed. Identification and adoption of mitigation of traffic and transportation impacts would primarily be the responsibility of the local general purpose public agency (e.g., city or county) or other agency that would typically serve as the lead agency on any given future facility.

#### **Level of Significance after Mitigation**

Since the SCAQMD cannot predict how a future lead agency might choose to mitigate a particular significant traffic and transportation impact, the potential exists for future indirect traffic and transportation impacts to be significant and unavoidable (i.e., significant even after imposition of feasible mitigation measures).

## **SUBCHAPTER 5.18**

---

### **CONSISTENCY**

#### **Introduction**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the SCAQMD have developed, with input from representatives of local government, the industry community, public health agencies, the USEPA - Region IX and the California ARB, guidance on how to assess consistency within the existing general development planning process in the Basin. Pursuant to the development and adoption of its Regional Comprehensive Plan Guide (RCPG), SCAG has developed an Intergovernmental Review Procedures Handbook (June 1, 1995). The SCAQMD also adopted criteria for assessing consistency with regional plans and the AQMP in its CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The following sections address consistency between the proposed project (i.e., proposed Rule 1315) and relevant regional plans pursuant to the SCAG Handbook and SCAQMD Handbook.

### **Consistency with Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) Policies**

The RCPG provides the primary reference for SCAG's project review activity. The RCPG serves as a regional framework for decision making for the growth and change that is anticipated during the next 20 years and beyond. The Growth Management Chapter (GMC) of the RCPG contains population, housing, and jobs forecasts, which are adopted by SCAG's Regional Council and that reflect local plans and policies, shall be used by SCAG in all phases of implementation and review. It states that the overall goals for the region are to (1) re-invigorate the region's economy, (2) avoid social and economic inequities and the geographical isolation of communities, and (3) maintain the region's quality of life. Growth in industry categories potentially eligible to receive permits for new or modified sources in reliance on Rules 1304 and 1309.1 are included in the projection of growth in the RCPG.

### **Consistency with Growth Management Chapter (GMC) to Improve the Regional Standard of Living**

The Growth Management goals are to develop urban forms that enable individuals to spend less income on housing cost, that minimize public and private development costs, and that enable firms to be more competitive, strengthen the regional strategic goal to stimulate the regional economy. The proposed project in relation to the GMC would neither interfere with the achievement of such goals nor with any powers exercised by local land use agencies. The proposed project would contribute to the GMC's goal of improving the regional standard of living by allowing various permitted-facility improvements, including modernization measures that would increase energy efficiency and reduce air pollution, as well as the installation of emergency equipment, and equipment necessary for essential public services. The proposed project would further efforts to minimize red tape and expedite the permitting process to maintain economic vitality and competitiveness.

### **Consistency with Growth Management Chapter (GMC) to Provide Social, Political and Cultural Equity**

The Growth Management goals to develop urban forms that avoid economic and social polarization promotes the regional strategic goals of minimizing social and geographic disparities and of reaching equity among all segments of society. Consistent with the Growth Management goals, local jurisdictions, employers and service agencies should provide adequate training and retraining of workers, and prepare the labor force to meet the challenges of the regional economy. Growth Management goals also include encouraging employment development in job-poor localities through support of labor force retraining programs and other economic development measures. Local jurisdictions and other service providers are responsible for developing sustainable communities and for providing, equally to all members of society, accessible and effective services such as: public education, housing, health care, social services, recreational facilities, law enforcement, and fire protection. Implementing the proposed project is not expected to interfere with the goals of providing social, political and cultural equity. To the extent that the proposed project enables provision of essential public services, the proposed project furthers the Growth Management goals pertaining to social, political and cultural equity.

### **Consistency with Growth Management Chapter (GMC) to Improve the Regional Quality of Life**

The Growth Management goals also include attaining mobility and clean air goals and developing urban forms that enhance quality of life, accommodate a diversity of life styles, preserve open space and natural resources, are aesthetically pleasing, preserve the character of communities, and enhance the regional strategic goal of maintaining the regional quality of life. The RCPG encourages planned development in locations least likely to cause environmental impacts, as well as supports the protection of vital resources such as wetlands, groundwater recharge areas, woodlands, production lands, and land containing unique and endangered plants and animals. While encouraging the implementation of measures aimed at the preservation and protection of recorded and unrecorded cultural resources and archaeological sites, the plan discourages development in areas with steep slopes, high fire, flood and seismic hazards, unless complying with special design requirements. Finally, the RCPG encourages mitigation measures that reduce noise in certain locations, measures aimed at preservation of biological and ecological resources, measures that would reduce exposure to seismic hazards, minimize earthquake damage, and develop emergency response and recovery plans. The proposed project in relation to the GMC is not expected to interfere with attaining these goals. The proposed rule would contribute to the regional quality of life because it would allow the modernization of equipment that would increase energy efficiency, and help support the operation of essential public services, including emergency service providers.

**Consistency with Regional Mobility Element (RMP) and Congestion Management Plan (CMP)**

The proposed project is consistent with the RMP and CMP in allowing access to the PM<sub>10</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC Priority Reserve accounts. The proposed project would provide greater options for facilities that require credits to comply with NSR requirements. The proposed project does not cause direct transportation impacts, but rather, the eligible facilities may implement projects that could increase traffic, worker commute trips, raw material or finished product transport trips or result in inadequate parking capacity.