

SUBCHAPTER 4.10

OTHER CEQA TOPICS

Growth-Inducing Impacts

Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided

Relationship Between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity

Environmental Effects Not Found to Be Significant

4.10 OTHER CEQA TOPICS

4.10.1 Growth-Inducing Impacts

CEQA defines growth-inducing impacts as those impacts of a proposed project that “could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects, which would remove obstacles to population growth” (CEQA Guidelines §15126.2 (d)).

To address this issue, potential growth-inducing effects are examined through the following considerations:

- Facilitation of economic effects that could result in other activities that could significantly affect the environment;
- Expansion requirements for one or more public services to maintain desired levels of service as a result of the proposed project;
- Removal of obstacles to growth through the construction or extension of major infrastructure facilities that do not presently exist in the project area or through changes in existing regulations pertaining to land development;
- Adding development or encroachment into open space; and/or
- Setting a precedent that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment.

4.10.1.1 Economic and Population Growth, and Related Public Services

The proposed project would not directly foster economic or population growth or the construction of new housing in the southern California area. The control measures contained in the 2012 AQMP accommodate the projected growth for the region while still resulting in compliance with the federal 24-hour PM_{2.5} ambient air quality standards and making expeditious progress towards attaining the federal one-hour and eight-hour ozone standards. However, the 2012 AQMP would not be the cause of residential, commercial, industrial, and infrastructure development.

A project would directly induce growth if it would directly foster economic or population growth or the construction of new housing in the surrounding environment (e.g., if it would remove an obstacle to growth by expanding existing infrastructure such as new roads or wastewater treatment plants). The 2012 AQMP would not remove barriers to population growth, as it involves no changes to a General Plan, zoning ordinance, or a related land use policy. Alternatively, the 2012 AQMP would not create barriers to projected population growth because it would result in avoiding sanctions or implementation of a Federal Implementation Plan, which could increase the New Source Review emission offset ratio or result in highway funding sanctions.

The 2012 AQMP does not include policies that would encourage the development of new housing or population-generating uses or infrastructure that would directly encourage such uses. The 2012 AQMP may indirectly increase the efficiency of the region's urban form through encouraging more air quality efficient development patterns. The 2012 AQMP does not change jurisdictional authority or responsibility concerning land use or property issues. Land use authority falls solely under the purview of the local governments. The SCAQMD is specifically excluded from infringing on existing city or county land use authority (California Health & Safety Code §40414). Therefore, the 2012 AQMP would not directly trigger new residential development in the area.

The 2012 AQMP may result in construction activities associated with implementation of certain control measures (e.g., control equipment at existing stationary sources or electrification along existing roadways). However, the [2012 AQMP](#) would not directly or indirectly stimulate substantial population growth, remove obstacles to population growth, or necessitate the construction of new community facilities that would lead to additional growth in the Basin. It is expected that construction workers will be largely drawn from the existing workforce pool in southern California.

Considering the existing workforce in the region and current unemployment rates, it is expected that a sufficient number of workers are available locally and that few or no workers would relocate for construction jobs potentially created by the 2012 AQMP as construction activities would be spread over a period of about 10 years. Further, the 2012 AQMP would not be expected to result in an increase in local population, housing, or associated public services (e.g., fire, police, schools, recreation, and library facilities) since no increase in population or the permanent number of workers is expected. Likewise, the proposed project would not create new demand for secondary services, including regional or specialty retail, restaurant or food delivery, recreation, or entertainment uses. As such, the 2012 AQMP would not foster economic or population growth in the surrounding area in a manner that would be growth-inducing.

4.10.1.2 Removal of Obstacles to Growth

The 2012 AQMP is located within an existing urbanized area where adequate infrastructure is already in place to serve the existing surrounding population. The proposed project would not employ activities or uses that would result in growth inducement, such as the development of new infrastructure (e.g., new roadway access or utilities) that would directly or indirectly cause the growth of new populations, communities, or currently undeveloped areas. The 2012 AQMP would require additional energy (electricity and potentially natural gas) but the increased energy requirements are expected to be within those projected for existing population growth of the region. The 2012 AQMP also encourages energy efficiency to minimize energy use. The 2012 AQMP may also result in the construction of overhead catenary lines to electrify existing roadways and transportation corridors. These transportation measures are expected to use existing roadways and are not expected to require the development of new roads or freeways. Likewise, the proposed project would not result in an expansion of existing public service facilities (e.g., police, fire, libraries, and schools) or the development of public service facilities that do not already exist.

4.10.1.3 Development or Encroachments into Open Space

Development can be considered growth-inducing when it is not contiguous to existing urban development and introduces development into open space areas. The proposed project is situated within the existing South Coast Air Basin, which is urbanized. The areas of the Basin where construction activities may occur would be at existing stationary sources and along transportation corridors. Stationary sources are generally located within commercial and industrial (urbanized) areas. Any related construction activities would be expected to be within the confines of the existing facilities and would not encroach into open space. The 2012 AQMP may also result in the construction of overhead catenary lines to electrify roadways and transportation corridors. These transportation measures are expected to use existing roadways and are not expected to require the development of new roads or freeways. Therefore, the 2012 AQMP would not result in development within or encroachment into an open space area.

4.10.1.4 Precedent Setting Action

The 2012 AQMP demonstrates attainment of the federal 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard by 2014 in the Basin through the adoption of all feasible control measures, and also provides updates to the 8-hour ozone control plan. The federal Clean Air Act requires a 24-hour PM_{2.5} non-attainment area to prepare a State Implementation Plan which must be submitted to the U.S. EPA. Therefore, the 2012 AQMP is being prepared to comply with state and federal air quality planning regulations and requirements. These required approvals are routine compliance actions and would not result in precedent-setting actions that might cause other significant environmental impacts (other than those evaluated in other sections of this [Final Program EIR](#)).

4.10.1.5 Conclusion

The 2012 AQMP was developed to comply with state and federal air quality planning requirements. The 2012 AQMP is not expected to foster economic or population growth or result in the construction of additional housing or other infrastructure, either directly or indirectly, that would further encourage growth. The 2012 AQMP could result in construction projects at existing stationary sources and along existing transportation corridors. However, the proposed project would not be considered growth-inducing, because it would not result in an increase in production of resources or cause a progression of growth that could significantly affect the environment either individually or cumulatively.

4.10.2 Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided

Section 15126.2 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, including those effects that can be mitigated but not reduced to a less than significant level. Irreversible changes include a large commitment of nonrenewable resources, committing future generations to specific uses of the environment (e.g., converting undeveloped land to urban uses), or enduring environmental damage due to an accident. The following is a summary of impacts associated with the 2012 AQMP that this [Draft-Final Program EIR](#) concluded are significant

and unavoidable. These impacts are also described in detail in the preceding portions of Chapter 4.0 of this [Final Program EIR](#).

- Air quality impacts associated with construction activities due to the implementation of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP were considered to be potentially significant for CO and PM10 emissions.
- The increased demand for electricity and natural gas associated with the 2012 [AQMP](#) control measures is considered to be significant.
- Water demand associated with the manufacture and use of waterborne coatings, solvents and other consumer products, and add-on air pollution control technologies are potentially significant. While mitigation measures are available, they can vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, and may remain significant.
- The potential hazards associated with LNG transport are considered significant.
- Noise and vibration impacts will be temporary in nature and related solely to construction activities, but could be significant.
- Traffic impacts associated with the construction and operation of catenary overhead electrical lines and fixed guideway systems are potentially significant.

Feasible mitigation measures have been developed for the identified adverse significant impacts; however, those mitigation measures may not reduce the impacts to less than significant. The 2012 AQMP would place only an incremental demand on nonrenewable and limited resources, such as energy and water supplies relative to the rate of use of these resources due to population growth and increased consumer demand. The largely irretrievable conversion of undeveloped/agricultural land to urban uses is a function of the growing population and local land use authority, not the 2012 AQMP. The 2012 AQMP is expected to result in long-term benefits associated with achieving ambient air quality standards and a reduction in the use of petroleum-based fuels (e.g., increased use of alternative fuels).

Conversely, positive environmental changes are expected to result from implementation of the 2012 AQMP. The project will result in significantly reduced emissions of air pollutants, thereby improving air quality and related public health. Emission reductions will also directly improve the vitality of crops and other plants. The health of livestock, domestic animals and other wildlife will be indirectly enhanced by the positive effects on plant life, as well as by any direct benefits attributable to less air pollution. The damage to buildings and other structures attributable to air pollution also will be diminished, as well as an improvement in aesthetics and visibility.

4.10.3 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity

An important consideration when analyzing the effects of a proposed project is whether it will result in short-term environmental benefits to the detriment of achieving long-term

goals or maximizing productivity of these resources. Implementing the 2012 AQMP is not expected to achieve short-term goals at the expense of long-term environmental productivity or goal achievement. The purpose of the 2012 AQMP is to set forth a comprehensive control program that will lead the Basin into compliance with the federal 24-hour PM_{2.5} air quality standards and achieving additional reductions in ozone precursors. By attaining federal and state air quality standards, the 2012 AQMP is expected to enhance short and long-term environmental productivity in the region.

Implementing the 2012 AQMP does not narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment. Of the potential environmental impacts discussed in Chapter 4, only those related to air quality impacts associated with construction activities, water demand, noise impacts associated with construction activities and traffic impacts associated with construction activities, are considered potentially significant. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures will ensure such impacts are mitigated to the greatest degree feasible.

Because no short-term environmental benefits are expected at the expense of long-term environmental goals being achieved, there is no justification for delaying the proposed action. This project must be implemented now as the SCAQMD is required by the Federal and state Clean Air Acts to formally review the [2012 AQMP](#) and adopt relevant plan revisions which will achieve the state and federal ambient air quality standards by the established deadline. The SCAQMD is proceeding with the 2012 AQMP pursuant to this mandate.

4.10.4 Environmental Effects Not Found to Be Significant

The environmental effects of the 2012 AQMP are identified and discussed in detail in the preceding portions of Chapter 4 of this [Final Program](#) EIR and in the Initial Study (see Appendix A) per the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines §15128. The following topics of analysis in this [Final Program](#) EIR were found to have no potentially significant adverse effects, after mitigation:

- Aesthetic impacts associated with implementation of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP.
- Air quality impacts associated with implementation (operation) of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP.
- Energy impacts associated with implementation of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP.
- Hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with implementation of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP.
- Hydrology and water quality impacts associated with implementation of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP (other than water demand).

- Land use impacts associated with implementation of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP.
- Noise impacts associated with implementation of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP (other than construction activities).
- Traffic impacts associated with implementation of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP (other than construction activities).
- Solid and hazardous waste impacts associated with implementation of the control measures in the 2012 AQMP.

While all the environmental topics required to be analyzed under CEQA were reviewed to determine if the proposed amendments would create significant impacts, the screening analysis (see Appendix A for the NOP/IS) concluded that the following environmental areas would not be significantly adversely affected by 2012 AQMP: agriculture and forest resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, and recreation. These topics were not analyzed in further detail in this environmental assessment, however, a brief discussion of each is provided below.

4.10.4.1 Agricultural and Forest Resources Impacts

In general, the 2012 AQMP control measures typically affect existing commercial or industrial facilities, establish specifications for fuels or mobile source exhaust emissions, or accelerate the replacement of high-emitting mobile sources with low emitting mobile sources so they are not expected to generate any new construction of buildings or other structures that would require conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conflict with zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. Further, the 2012 AQMP control measures typically affect existing facilities that are located in appropriately zoned areas. Any new facilities that may be affected by the 2012 AQMP control measures would be constructed and operated for reasons other than complying with the 2012 AQMP control measures. For these same reasons, it is not expected that implementing 2012 AQMP control measures will conflict with any forest land zoning codes or convert forest land to non-forest uses. No control measures were identified in the proposed 2012 AQMP that would affect or conflict with existing land use plans, policies, or regulations or require conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses.

Land use, including agricultural- and forest-related uses, and other planning considerations are determined by local governments and no agricultural land use or planning requirements will be altered by the proposed project, except as noted above. The 2012 AQMP control measures, including control measures related to mobile sources, would have no direct or indirect effects on agricultural or forest land resources because these types of control measures typically involve reduction in combustion and fugitive VOC emissions, as well as establishing emission

Based upon the above considerations, significant adverse impacts to agricultural and forestland resources are not expected due to implementation of the 2012 AQMP.

4.10.4.2 Biological Resources Impacts

The effects of implementing [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures typically include reducing mobile source exhaust emissions; modifying fuel specifications; or modifications at existing commercial or industrial facilities to control or further control emissions, which may require some type of construction equipment and activities. Any affected existing commercial or industrial facilities are generally located in appropriately zoned commercial or industrial areas, which typically do not support candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Typically, existing industrial or commercial facilities are already devoid of plant life or plant life supporting wildlife species for fire safety reasons. Any new industrial or commercial facilities that may be affected by [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures and that have the potential to adversely affect biological resources would be constructed and operated for reasons unrelated to complying with [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures.

Similarly, modifications at existing facilities would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with native or resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites because implementing [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures typically occurs within the boundaries of the affected facilities and, therefore, would not require disturbing wildlife habitat. For these same reasons, since the proposed 2012 AQMP primarily regulates stationary emission sources at existing commercial or industrial facilities, it does not directly or indirectly affect land use policy that may adversely affect riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or identified by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. It is expected that industrial or commercial facilities that may be affected by 2012 AQMP control measures are already located in appropriately zoned areas or would be located in appropriately zoned areas. [The 2012 AQMP](#) control measures do not include any provisions that would allow affected facility operators to violate existing zoning ordinances or regional plans, policies, or regulations. Improving air quality is expected to provide health benefits to plant and animal species in the district. Similarly, the 2012 AQMP contains control measures that establish emission standards for mobile sources or accelerated penetration of low emission vehicles, which could result in additional control of emissions from mobile sources or revision to existing fuel specifications. As a result, the proposed project would not affect land use policies or designations. There are no control measures contained in the 2012 AQMP that would alter this determination.

Implementing some [of the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures (e.g., coatings and solvent control measures) could change or increase a facility's potential to generate waste water. Past SCAQMD staff experience with analyzing modifications at industrial or commercial facilities is that they are considered "point sources" and must release wastewater into publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) (e.g., local sewer systems), and, therefore, are subject to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program

administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Direct discharge into federally protected wetlands as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act would be prohibited under federal law (Clean Water Act) and state law (Porter-Cologne Act) and, therefore, is not expected to occur. Some [of the](#) 2012 AQMP control measures have the potential to require air pollution controls at port facilities, which are located on the coast. Port facilities are considered to be heavy industrial facilities (point sources) and the installation of additional controls would be consistent with this land use. Further, any facilities that release wastewater into California's ocean waters are subject to water quality standards established in the California Ocean Plan and are also subject to NPDES requirements, enforced by the local RWQCBs. For all of the above reasons the proposed project will not adversely affect protected wetlands as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means.

Implementing the proposed 2012 AQMP is not expected to affect land use plans, local policies or ordinances, or regulations protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance for the reasons given in discussions above, i.e. control measures promulgated as rules or regulations primarily affect existing commercial and industrial facilities through installation of air pollution control equipment, which are typically located in appropriately zoned areas or activities that would accelerate the penetration of low emission vehicles into the regional vehicle fleet. Land use and other planning considerations are determined by local governments and no land use or planning requirements will be altered by the proposed project. Neither SCAQMD nor CARB has legal authority over land use decisions except to impose certain air pollution control requirements, which do not drive the land use approval process, and, therefore, cannot alter or interfere with land use zoning ordinance or designations and cannot approve new land use projects or modifications to existing land use projects. Similarly, the proposed 2012 AQMP is not expected to affect in any way habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans, agricultural resources or operations, and would not create divisions in any existing communities for the reasons discussed above.

Based upon the above considerations, significant adverse impacts to biological resources are not expected due to implementation of the 2012 AQMP.

4.10.4.3 Cultural Resource Impacts

Implementing the proposed 2012 AQMP control measures is primarily expected to result in controlling stationary source emissions at existing commercial or industrial facilities or accelerate the penetration of low emission vehicles into the regional vehicle fleet. Affected facilities where physical modifications may occur are typically located in appropriately zoned commercial or industrial areas that have previously been disturbed and are not typically considered to be historically significant. It is unlikely that construction activities, including heavy construction activities, such as cut-and-fill activities or excavation, at potentially affected existing facilities would uncover cultural resources as these existing facilities are located in previously disturbed areas. Some affected facilities (e.g., refineries) may have equipment older than 50 years that may need to be modified to comply with 2012 AQMP control measures. However, such equipment does not typically meet the criteria

identified in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 [\(a\)\(3\)](#). Based on these considerations, it is unlikely that implementing control measures in the proposed 2012 AQMP would: adversely affect historical or archaeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, destroy unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features, or disturb human remains interred outside formal cemeteries.

In spite of the fact that most facilities that would be affected by 2012 AQMP control measures are located on previously disturbed sites where there is little likelihood of any remaining identifiable artifacts, it is possible, that implementing control measures could result in construction activities to install pollution control equipment at affected existing facilities that uncover cultural or archaeological resources. Even if this circumstance were to occur, significant adverse cultural resources impacts are not anticipated because there are existing laws in place that are designed to protect and mitigate potential adverse impacts to cultural resources. As with any construction activity, should archaeological resources be found during construction that results from implementing the proposed [2012](#) AQMP control measures, the activity would cease until a thorough archaeological assessment is conducted as required by state or federal law.

The proposed 2012 AQMP is, therefore, not anticipated to result in any construction activity or promote any programs that could have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources in the district.

4.10.4.4 Geology and Soils Impacts

The proposed 2012 AQMP control measures would not directly or indirectly expose people or structures to earthquake faults, seismic shaking, seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction, landslides, mudslides or substantial soil erosion for the following reasons. In general, [the 2012](#) AQMP control measures affecting mobile sources, such as those that would accelerate the penetration of zero or low emission vehicles into district fleets, would not affect geology or soils because for on-road vehicles, they would continue to operate on existing roadways (ONRD-1, Accelerated Penetration of Partial Zero-Emission and Zero Emission Vehicles; ONRD-03, Accelerated Penetration of Partial Zero-Emission and Zero Emission Medium-Heavy-Duty Vehicles; etc.). Although some [of the 2012](#) AQMP control measures would accelerate the penetration of zero or low emission off-road equipment, replacing one type of off-road engine with a lower emitting off-road engine would not be expected to affect construction activities. Further, construction activities occur for reasons other than complying with [the 2012](#) AQMP control measures.

When implemented as rules or regulations, [the 2012](#) AQMP control measures regulating stationary sources do not directly or indirectly promote new land use projects that could be located on earthquake faults, seismic zones, etc. Any seismic-related activities in areas where facilities that may be subject to [the 2012](#) AQMP control [measures](#) are located would be part of the existing setting. Some minor structural modifications, however, at existing affected facilities may occur as a result of installing control equipment or making process modifications. Such modifications would not likely require large heavy-duty construction equipment or substantial site modifications. In any event, existing affected facilities or modifications to existing facilities would be required to comply with relevant California

Building Code (formerly referred to as the Uniform Building Code) requirements in effect at the time of initial construction or modification of a structure.

Southern California is an area of known seismic activity. Structures must be designed to comply with the California Building Code requirements if they are located in a seismically active area. The local city or county is responsible for ensuring that a proposed project complies with current California Building Code requirements as part of the issuance of the building permits and can conduct inspections to ensure compliance. The California Building Code is considered to be a standard safeguard against major structural failures and loss of life. The goal of the code is to provide structures that will: 1) resist minor earthquakes without damage; 2) resist moderate earthquakes without structural damage but with some non-structural damage; and 3) resist major earthquakes without collapse but with some structural and non-structural damage.

The California Building Code bases seismic design on minimum lateral seismic forces (“ground shaking”). The California Building Code requirements operate on the principle that providing appropriate foundations, among other aspects, helps to protect buildings from failure during earthquakes. The basic formulas used for the California Building Code seismic design require determination of the seismic zone and site coefficient, which represent the foundation conditions at the site. Accordingly, buildings and equipment at existing affected facilities are likely to conform to the California Building Code and all other applicable state codes in effect at the time they were constructed.

Any potentially affected facilities that are located in areas where there has been historic occurrence of liquefaction (e.g., coastal zones) or existing conditions indicate a potential for liquefaction, including expansive or unconsolidated granular soils and a high water table, may have the potential for liquefaction-induced impacts at the project sites. The California Building Code requirements consider liquefaction potential and establish more stringent requirements for building foundations in areas potentially subject to liquefaction. Compliance with the California Building Code requirements is expected to minimize the potential impacts associated with liquefaction. The issuance of building permits from the local cities or counties will assure compliance with the California Building Code requirements. Finally, [none of the 2012](#) AQMP control measures require the location of new, or relocation of existing facilities in areas prone to liquefaction. Land use decisions are under the authority of the local jurisdictions, typically cities or counties. Neither the SCAQMD nor CARB has authority over land use decisions except to impose specific air pollution control requirements, which do not drive the land use approval process, and CEQA does not grant an agency new powers independent of the powers granted to the agency by other laws (CEQA Guidelines §15040 (b)).

Because facilities affected by any [of the 2012](#) AQMP control measures are typically located in appropriately zoned areas such as industrial or commercial areas, which are not typically located near known geological hazards (e.g., landslide, mudflow, seiche, tsunami or volcanic hazards), no significant adverse geological impacts are expected. Even if potentially affected facilities are located near such geological hazards, the hazards are part of the existing setting and are not made worse by installing control equipment or other activities to comply with emission control rules and regulations. For example, tsunamis at

the Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach, are not expected because the ports are surrounded by breakwaters that protect the area from wave action. In any event, [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures would not increase potential exposures to tsunamis.

Although the proposed 2012 AQMP control measures may require minor modifications at existing industrial or commercial facilities, such modifications are not expected to require substantial grading or construction activities. Typically, existing facilities have already been graded and soil stabilization is already in place (e.g., through the placement of buildings, paving, or other soil stabilization measures currently required pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust). In other cases, potentially affected areas may have already been graded or displaced in some way for other reasons (e.g., leveling the site, stabilization of slopes, etc.). Accelerating the penetration of low emission vehicles into the regional vehicle fleet, (ONRD-1, Accelerated Penetration of Partial Zero-Emission and Zero Emission Vehicles; ONRD-03, Accelerated Penetration of Partial Zero-Emission and Zero Emission Medium-Heavy-Duty Vehicles, etc.), does not require modifications requiring construction activities at existing facilities. Therefore, significant adverse soil erosion impacts are not anticipated from implementing the 2012 AQMP.

Septic tanks or other similar alternative waste water disposal systems are typically associated with small residential projects in remote areas. The proposed 2012 AQMP does not contain any control measures that generate construction of residential or other types of land use projects in remote areas. Neither the SCAQMD nor CARB has land use approval authority. Consequently, construction of small residential land uses with septic systems would occur for reasons other than complying with [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures. Further, [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures typically affect existing industrial or commercial facilities that are already hooked up to appropriate sewerage facilities and are subject to wastewater control requirements, typically through NPDES permits.

Based on these considerations, implementation of the 2012 AQMP is not expected to generate significant adverse geology and soils impacts.

4.10.4.5 Mineral Resources Impacts

There are no provisions of the proposed 2012 AQMP that would directly result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state, such as aggregate, coal, clay, shale, etc., or of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. Moreover, the 2012 AQMP is not expected to deplete non-renewable mineral resources in a wasteful manner.

Based upon the above considerations, significant adverse impacts to mineral resources are not expected due to implementation of the 2012 AQMP.

4.10.4.6 Population and Housing Impacts

According to SCAG, current population in the SCAG region (which includes all of the district, the non-district portions of Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties, and all of Ventura and Imperial counties) is approximately 18 million people and is expected to

increase by another four million people by 2035. The proposed 2012 AQMP generally affects existing commercial or industrial facilities located in predominantly industrial or commercial urbanized areas throughout the district and, as such, is not anticipated to generate any significant effects, either directly or indirectly, on the district's population or population distribution.

Consistent with past experience, it is expected that the existing labor pool within the southern California area would accommodate the labor requirements for any modifications requiring construction at affected facilities. This is especially true in the current recession. For example, California has a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 10.9 percent. Unemployment rates (not seasonally adjusted) in each of the four district counties are as follows: Los Angeles County, 11.5 percent; Orange County, 8.1 percent; Riverside County, 12.8 percent, and San Bernardino County, 12.1 percent.

It is expected that few or no new employees would need to be hired at affected facilities to operate and maintain new control equipment on site because air pollution control equipment is typically not labor intensive equipment. In the event that new employees are hired, it is expected that the existing local labor pool in the district can accommodate any increase in demand for workers that might occur as a result of adopting the proposed 2012 AQMP. Based on the above, it is not expected that the 2012 AQMP would induce population growth resulting in the need for new housing, roads or other infrastructure. As such, adopting the proposed 2012 AQMP is not expected to result in changes in population densities or induce significant growth in population.

In general, [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures affecting mobile sources, such as those that would accelerate the penetration of zero or low emission vehicles into district fleets (e.g., ONRD-1, Accelerated Penetration of Partial Zero-Emission and Zero Emission Vehicles; ONRD-03, Accelerated Penetration of Partial Zero-Emission and Zero Emission Medium-Heavy-Duty Vehicles, etc.), would not induce population growth because there is a finite number of drivers in the region at any one time, so drivers who purchase low or zero emission vehicles would not be driving the old high emitting vehicles at the same time they are driving the new low emitting vehicles. Although projected increases in population in the region may result in the continued use of the replaced high emitting vehicles, as already noted, future population growth in the region would occur for reasons other than complying with [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures.

There are no provisions in any [of the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures that would cause displacement of substantial numbers of people or housing necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As noted in the discussions under "Land Use and Planning, the proposed 2012 AQMP contains control measures that may result in installing control equipment on stationary sources at existing commercial or institutional facilities and establishing emission exhaust specifications for mobile sources. Construction of new structures affecting land use planning would occur for reasons other than complying with [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures. As a result, the proposed 2012 AQMP would not be expected to affect the location of people or housing in any areas of the district.

Based upon the above considerations, significant adverse population and housing impacts are not expected to occur due to implementation of the 2012 AQMP.

4.10.4.7 Public Services Impacts

There is little potential for significant adverse public service impacts as a result of adopting the proposed 2012 AQMP. The 2003 AQMP EIR analyzed potential adverse impacts to public services as a result of implementing [the 2003 AQMP](#) control measures and concluded that existing resources at services such as fire departments, police departments and local governments would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of implementing [the 2003 AQMP](#) control measures even if there are slight increases in potential flammability impacts from implementing [the 2003 AQMP](#) control measures. Similarly, the 2007 NOP/IS concluded that implementing [the 2007 AQMP](#) control measures would not significantly adversely affect fire departments, police departments and local governments for the same reasons as identified in the 2003 Program EIR, which include the following considerations. Although implementing [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures may increase the use of alternative clean fuels, for example, there would be a commensurate reduction in currently used petroleum fuels. As first responders to emergency situations, police and fire departments may assist local hazmat teams with containing hazardous materials, putting out fires, and crowd control to reduce public exposures to hazardous materials releases. In many situations, implementing [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures may reduce hazardous materials use (e.g., formulating coatings with less hazardous aqueous formulations). Some [of the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures may increase the use of air pollution control equipment that uses hazardous materials. In spite of this, there are no components of any control measures that would result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. Further, most large industrial facilities have on-site security that controls public access to facilities so no increase in the need for police services are expected. Many large industrial facilities also have on-site fire protection personnel and/or have agreements for fire protection services with local fire departments. Even in the absence of onsite police or fire protection services, implementing [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures in no way hinders service ratios or response times and is not expected to require physical modifications to existing government facilities to a greater extent than is currently the case. Finally, pursuant to the Health and Safety Code, emergency or rescue vehicles operated by local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies, police and sheriff departments, fire department, hospital, medical or paramedic facility, and used for responding to situations where potential threats to life or property exist, including, but not limited to fire, ambulance calls, or life-saving calls are specifically exempt from regulations requiring alternative clean fueled vehicles. For these reasons, implementing the 2012 AQMP is not expected to require additional fire protection services to an extent that it would cause a need for construction of new facilities.

As indicated in the discussions under Population and Housing, the 2012 AQMP is not anticipated to affect population growth in the district, which would not be expected to adversely affect existing public services or facilities or physically alter, require new public service facilities, or alter the demand for schools. Anticipated development to accommodate future population growth would occur for reasons other than complying with [the 2012 AQMP](#) control measures. To address future growth it is the responsibility of local land

public agencies with general land use authority, typically cities or counties, over fire departments, police departments and other public services to address potential impacts to public services that may require new or physically altered facilities or affect service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Consequently, no significant adverse impacts to schools or parks are foreseen as a result of adopting the proposed 2012 AQMP.

Based upon the above considerations, significant adverse project-specific public services impacts are not expected to occur due to implementation of the 2012 AQMP.

4.10.4.8 Recreation Impacts

As discussed under “Land Use and Planning” and “Population and Housing” above, there are no provisions in the proposed 2012 AQMP that would affect land use plans, policies, ordinances, or regulations. Land use and other planning considerations are determined by local governments. No land use or planning requirements, including those related to recreational facilities, will be altered by the proposal. The proposed project does not have the potential to directly or indirectly induce population growth or redistribution that could adversely affect recreational resources. As a result, the proposed project would not increase the use of, or demand for existing neighborhood and/or regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Based upon the above considerations, no significant adverse project-specific impacts to population and housing are expected to occur due to implementation of the 2012 AQMP.