



BAY AREA  
AIR QUALITY  
MANAGEMENT  
DISTRICT

**California Environmental Quality Act  
Guidelines Update**

**Proposed Thresholds of Significance**

**December 7, 2009**



# Table of Contents

Section	Page
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 BAAQMD/CEQA Regulatory Authority .....	1
1.2 Justification for Updating CEQA Thresholds.....	3
<b>2 Greenhouse Gas Thresholds .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.2 Proposed Thresholds of Significance.....	7
2.3 Justification and Substantial Evidence Supporting Thresholds .....	7
2.3.1 Scientific and Regulatory Justification .....	8
2.3.2 Project-Level GHG Thresholds .....	10
2.3.3 Plan-Level GHG Thresholds.....	22
2.3.4 Climate Action Plans .....	24
2.3.5 Stationary Source GHG Threshold .....	26
2.3.6 Summary of Justification for GHG Thresholds.....	27
<b>3 Community Risk and Hazard Thresholds.....</b>	<b>30</b>
3.2 Proposed Thresholds of Significance.....	31
3.3 Justification and Substantial Evidence Supporting Thresholds .....	34
3.3.1 Scientific and Regulatory Justification .....	34
3.3.2 Construction, Land Use and Stationary Source Risk and Hazard Thresholds	41
3.3.3 Cumulative Risk and Hazard Thresholds .....	44
3.3.4 Plan-Level Risk and Hazard Thresholds.....	46
3.3.5 Community Risk Reduction Plans.....	47
<b>4 Criteria Pollutant Thresholds.....</b>	<b>48</b>
4.2 Proposed Thresholds of Significance.....	48
4.3 Justification and Substantial Evidence Supporting Thresholds .....	48
4.3.1 Project Construction Criteria Pollutant Thresholds .....	48
4.3.2 Project Operation Criteria Pollutant Thresholds.....	49
4.3.3 Local Carbon Monoxide Thresholds .....	50
4.3.4 Plan-Level Criteria Pollutant Thresholds.....	50
<b>5 Odor Thresholds .....</b>	<b>51</b>
5.2 Proposed Thresholds of Significance.....	51
5.3 Justification and Substantial Evidence Supporting Thresholds.....	51
<b>References.....</b>	<b>53</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1 – Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance .....	4
Table 2 – California 1990, 2002-2004, and 2020 Land Use Sector GHG <sup>1</sup> .....	15
Table 3 – 2020 Land Use Sector GHG Emission Reductions from State Regulations and AB 32 Measures .....	16
Table 4 – SFBAAB 1990, 2007, and 2020 Land Use Sector GHG Emissions Inventories and Projections (MMT CO <sub>2</sub> e/yr) .....	17
Table 5 – Operational GHG Threshold Sensitivity Analysis .....	20
Table 6 – California 2020 GHG Emissions, Population Projections and GHG Efficiency Thresholds - Land Use Inventory Sectors .....	21
Table 7 – California 2020 GHG Emissions, Population Projections and GHG Efficiency Thresholds - All Inventory Sectors .....	23
Table 8 – Statistical Summary of Population-Weighted Ambient Cancer Risk.....	31
Table 9 – Screening Distances for Potential Odor Sources.....	52

## Bay Area Air Quality Management District

# Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD or Air District) staff analyzed various options for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) air quality thresholds of significance for use within BAAQMD's jurisdiction. The analysis and evaluation undertaken by Air District staff is documented in the *Revised Draft Options and Justification Report – California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance* (Draft Options Report) (BAAQMD October 2009).

Air District staff hosted public workshops in February, April, September and October 2009 at several locations around the Bay Area. In addition, Air District staff met with regional stakeholder groups to discuss and receive input on the threshold options being evaluated. Throughout the course of the public workshops and stakeholder meetings Air District staff received many comments on the various options under consideration. Based on comments received and additional staff analysis, the threshold options and staff-recommended thresholds were further refined. The culmination of this year-long effort was presented in the Proposed Thresholds of Significance Report published on November 2, 2009 as the Air District staff's proposed air quality thresholds of significance.

The Air District Board of Directors (Board) held public hearings on November 18 and December 2, 2009, to receive comments on staff's Proposed Thresholds of Significance (November 2009). After public testimony and Board deliberations, the Board requested staff to present additional options for risk and hazard thresholds for Board consideration. This Report includes risks and hazards threshold options, as requested by the Board, in addition to staff's previously recommended thresholds of significance. The proposed thresholds presented herein, upon adoption by the Air District Board of Directors, are intended to replace all of the Air District's currently recommended thresholds. The proposed air quality thresholds of significance, and Board-requested risk and hazard threshold options, are provided in Table 1 at the end of this introduction.

### 1.1 BAAQMD/CEQA REGULATORY AUTHORITY

The BAAQMD has direct and indirect regulatory authority over sources of air pollution in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). CEQA requires that public agencies consider the potential adverse environmental impacts of any project that a public agency proposes to carry out, fund or approve. CEQA requires that a lead agency prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) whenever it can be fairly argued (the "fair argument" standard), based on substantial evidence,<sup>1</sup> that a project may have a significant effect<sup>2</sup> on

---

<sup>1</sup> "Substantial evidence" includes facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, or expert opinions supported by facts, but does not include argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, evidence that is clearly inaccurate or erroneous, or evidence of social or

the environment, even if there is substantial evidence to the contrary (CEQA Guidelines §15064). CEQA requires that the lead agency review not only a project's direct effects on the environment, but also the cumulative impacts of a project and other projects causing related impacts. When the incremental effect of a project is cumulatively considerable, the lead agency must discuss the cumulative impacts in an EIR. (CEQA Guidelines §15064).

The "fair argument" standard refers to whether a fair argument can be made that a project may have a significant effect on the environment (*No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (1974) 13 Cal.3d 68, 84). The fair argument standard is generally considered a low threshold requirement for preparation of an EIR. The legal standards reflect a preference for requiring preparation of an EIR and for "resolving doubts in favor of environmental review." *Meija v. City of Los Angeles* (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 322, 332. "The determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment calls for careful judgment on the part of the public agency involved, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data." (CEQA Guidelines §15064(b)).

In determining whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7 provides that lead agencies may adopt and/or apply "thresholds of significance." A threshold of significance is "an identifiable quantitative, qualitative or performance level of a particular environmental effect, non-compliance with which means the effect will normally be determined to be significant by the agency and compliance with which means the effect normally will be determined to be less than significant" (CEQA Guidelines §15064.7).

While thresholds of significance give rise to a presumption of insignificance, thresholds are not conclusive, and do not excuse a public agency of the duty to consider evidence that a significant effect may occur under the fair argument standard. *Meija*, 130 Cal. App. 4th at 342. "A public agency cannot apply a threshold of significance or regulatory standard 'in a way that forecloses the consideration of any other substantial evidence showing there may be a significant effect.'" *Id.* This means that if a public agency is presented with factual information or other substantial evidence establishing a fair argument that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, the agency must prepare an EIR to study those impacts even if the project's impacts fall below the applicable threshold of significance.

Thresholds of significance must be supported by substantial evidence. This Report provides the substantial evidence in support of the thresholds of significance developed by the BAAQMD. If adopted by the BAAQMD Board of Directors, the Air District will recommend that lead agencies within the nine counties of the BAAQMD's jurisdiction

---

economic impacts that do not contribute to, or are not caused by, physical impacts on the environment. Cal. Pub. Res. C. §21080(c); *see also* CEQA Guidelines §15384.

<sup>2</sup> A "significant effect" on the environment is defined as a "substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment." Cal. Pub. Res. C. §21068; *see also* CEQA Guidelines §15382.

use the thresholds of significance in this Report when considering the air quality impacts of projects under their consideration.

## **1.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR UPDATING CEQA THRESHOLDS**

Any analysis of environmental impacts under CEQA includes an assessment of the nature and extent of each impact expected to result from the project to determine whether the impact will be treated as significant or less than significant. CEQA gives lead agencies discretion whether to classify a particular environmental impact as significant. Ultimately, formulation of a standard of significance requires the lead agency to make a policy judgment about where the line should be drawn distinguishing adverse impacts it considers significant from those that are not deemed significant. This judgment must, however, be based on scientific information and other factual data to the extent possible (CEQA Guidelines §15064(b)).

In the sense that advances in science provide new or refined factual data, combined with advances in technology and the gradual improvement or degradation of an environmental resource, the point where an environmental effect is considered significant is fluid over time. Other factors influencing this fluidity include new or revised regulations and standards, and emerging, new areas of concern.

In the ten years since BAAQMD last reviewed its recommended CEQA thresholds of significance for air quality, there have been tremendous changes that affect the quality and management of the air resources in the Bay Area. Traditional criteria air pollutant ambient air quality standards, at both the state and federal levels, have become increasingly more stringent. A new criteria air pollutant standard for fine particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) has been added to federal and state ambient air quality standards. We have found, through technical advances in impact assessment, that toxic air contaminants are not only worse than previously thought from a health perspective, but that certain communities experience high levels of toxic air contaminants, giving rise to new regulations and programs to reduce the significantly elevated levels of ambient toxic air contaminant concentrations in the Bay Area.

In response to the elevated levels of toxic air contaminants in some Bay Area communities, the Air District created the Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program. Phase 1 of the BAAQMD's CARE program compiled and analyzed a regional emissions inventory of toxic air contaminants (TACs), including emissions from stationary sources, area sources, and on-road and off-road mobile sources. Phase 2 of the CARE Program conducted regional computer modeling of selected TAC species, species which collectively posed the greatest risk to Bay Area residents. In both Phases 1 and 2, demographic data were combined with estimates of TAC emissions or concentrations to identify communities that are disproportionately impacted from high concentrations of TACs. Bay Area Public Health Officers, in discussions with Air District staff and in comments to the Air District's Advisory Council (February 11, 2009, Advisory Council Meeting on Air Quality and Public Health), have recommended that PM<sub>2.5</sub>, in addition to TACs, be considered in assessments of community-scale impacts of air pollution.

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

Another significant issue that affects the quality of life for Bay Area residents is the growing concern with global climate change. In just the past few years, estimates of the global atmospheric temperature and greenhouse gas concentration limits needed to stabilize climate change have been adjusted downward and the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions considered more dire. Previous scientific assessments assumed that limiting global temperature rise to 2-3°C above pre-industrial levels would stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the range of 450-550 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide-equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e). Now the science indicates that a temperature rise of 2°C would not prevent dangerous interference with the climate system. Recent scientific assessments suggest that global temperature rise should be kept below 2°C by stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations below 350 ppm CO<sub>2</sub>e, a significant reduction from the current level of 385 ppm CO<sub>2</sub>e.

For the reasons stated above, and to further the goals of other District programs such as encouraging transit-oriented and infill development, BAAQMD has undertaken an effort to review all of its currently-recommended CEQA thresholds, revise them as appropriate, and develop new thresholds where appropriate. The overall goal of this effort is to develop CEQA significance criteria that ensure new development implements appropriate and feasible emission reduction measures to mitigate significant air quality impacts. The Air District's recommended CEQA significance thresholds have been vetted through a public review process and will be presented to the BAAQMD Board of Directors for adoption.

<b>Table 1 – Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance</b>			
<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Construction-Related</b>	<b>Operational-Related</b>	
<b>Project-Level</b>			
<b>Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors (Regional)</b>	<b>Average Daily Emissions (lb/day)</b>	<b>Average Daily Emissions (lb/day)</b>	<b>Maximum Annual Emissions (tpy)</b>
ROG	54	54	10
NO <sub>x</sub>	54	54	10
PM <sub>10</sub> (exhaust)	82	82	15
PM <sub>2.5</sub> (exhaust)	54	54	10
PM <sub>10</sub> /PM <sub>2.5</sub> (fugitive dust)	Best Management Practices	None	
Local CO	None	9.0 ppm (8-hour average), 20.0 ppm (1-hour average)	
<b>GHGs Projects other than Stationary Sources</b>	None	Compliance with Qualified Climate Action Plan OR 1,100 MT of CO <sub>2</sub> e/yr OR 4.6 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/SP/yr (residents + employees)	

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

<b>Table 1 – Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance</b>		
<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Construction-Related</b>	<b>Operational-Related</b>
<b>GHGs</b> <b>Stationary Sources</b>	None	10,000 MT/yr
<b>Risks and Hazards</b> (Individual Project)  <b><u>Staff Proposal</u></b>	Same as Operational Thresholds*	<p><b><u>All Areas: Siting a New Source or Receptor</u></b></p> <p>Compliance with Qualified Risk Reduction Plan OR Increased cancer risk of &gt;10.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase: &gt; 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average</p> <p><u>Zone of Influence:</u> 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</p>
<b>Risks and Hazards</b> (Individual Project)  <b><u>Board Option 1</u></b>  <b>Tiered Thresholds</b>	Same as Operational Thresholds*	<p><b><u>Impacted Communities: Siting a New Source</u></b></p> <p>Compliance with Qualified Risk Reduction Plan OR Increased cancer risk of &gt;5.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase: &gt; 0.2 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average</p> <p><u>Zone of Influence:</u> 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <p><b><u>Impacted Communities: Siting a New Receptor</u></b> <b><u>All Other Areas: Siting a New Source or Receptor</u></b></p> <p>Compliance with Qualified Risk Reduction Plan OR Increased cancer risk of &gt;10.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase: &gt; 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average</p> <p><u>Zone of Influence:</u> 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</p>
<b>Risks and Hazards</b> (Individual Project)  <b><u>Board Option 2</u></b>  <b>Quantitative Thresholds</b>	Same as Operational Thresholds*	<p><b><u>All Areas: Siting a New Source or Receptor</u></b></p> <p>Increased cancer risk of &gt;10.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase: &gt; 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average</p> <p><u>Zone of Influence:</u> 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</p>

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

<b>Table 1 – Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance</b>		
<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Construction-Related</b>	<b>Operational-Related</b>
<b>Risks and Hazards</b> (Cumulative Thresholds)	Same as Operational Thresholds*	<p style="text-align: center;"><u><b>All Areas: Siting a New Source or Receptor</b></u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Compliance with Qualified Risk Reduction Plan OR Cancer: &gt; 100 in a million (from all local sources) Non-cancer: &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (from all local sources) (Chronic or Acute) PM<sub>2.5</sub>: &gt; 0.8 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average (from all local sources)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Zone of Influence: 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</u></p>
<b>Accidental Release of Acutely Hazardous Air Pollutants</b>	None	Storage or use of acutely hazardous materials locating near receptors or receptors locating near stored or used acutely hazardous materials considered significant
<b>Odors</b>	None	Screening Level Distances and Complaint History
<b>Plan-Level</b>		
<b>Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors (Regional and Local)</b>	None	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consistency with Current Air Quality Plan control measures</li> <li>2. Projected VMT or vehicle trip increase is less than or equal to projected population increase</li> </ol>
<b>GHGs</b>	None	Compliance with Qualified Climate Action Plan (or similar criteria included in a General Plan) OR 6.6 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/ SP/yr (residents + employees)
<b>Risks and Hazards/Odors</b>	None	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overlay zones around existing and planned sources of TACs (including adopted Risk Reduction Plan areas) and odors</li> <li>2. Overlay zones of at least 500 feet (or Air District-approved modeled distance) from all freeways and high volume roadways</li> </ol>
<b>Accidental Release of Acutely Hazardous Air Pollutants</b>	None	None
<p>Notes: CO = carbon monoxide; CO<sub>2</sub>e = carbon dioxide equivalent; GHGs = greenhouse gases; lb/day = pounds per day; MT = metric tons; NO<sub>x</sub> = oxides of nitrogen; PM<sub>2.5</sub> = fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less; PM<sub>10</sub> = respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 10 micrometers or less; ppm = parts per million; ROG = reactive organic gases; SO<sub>2</sub> = sulfur dioxide; SP = service population; TACs = toxic air contaminants; TBP = toxic best practices; tons/day = tons per day; tpy = tons per year; yr = year.</p> <p>* Note: The Air District recommends that for construction projects that are less than one year duration, Lead Agencies should annualize impacts over the scope of actual days that peak impacts are to occur, rather than the full year.</p>		

## 2 GREENHOUSE GAS THRESHOLDS

BAAQMD does not currently have an adopted threshold of significance for GHG emissions. BAAQMD currently recommends that lead agencies quantify GHG emissions resulting from new development and apply all feasible mitigation measures to lessen the potentially adverse impacts. One of the primary objectives in updating the current CEQA Guidelines is to identify a GHG significance threshold, analytical methodologies, and mitigation measures to ensure new land use development meets its fair share of the emission reductions needed to address the cumulative environmental impact from GHG emissions. GHG emissions contribute, on a cumulative basis, to the significant adverse environmental impacts of global climate change. As reviewed herein, climate change impacts include an increase in extreme heat days, higher ambient concentrations of air pollutants, sea level rise, impacts to water supply and water quality, public health impacts, impacts to ecosystems, impacts to agriculture, and other environmental impacts. No single land use project could generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global average temperature. The combination of GHG emissions from past, present, and future projects contribute substantially to the phenomenon of global climate change and its associated environmental impacts.

### 2.2 PROPOSED THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Project Type	Proposed Thresholds
Projects other than Stationary Sources	Compliance with Qualified Climate Action Plan OR 1,100 MT of CO <sub>2</sub> e/yr OR 4.6 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/SP/yr* (residents + employees)
Stationary Sources	10,000 MT of CO <sub>2</sub> e/yr
Plans	Compliance with Qualified Climate Action Plan (or similar criteria included in a General Plan) OR 6.6 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/SP/yr (residents + employees)

\* Staff notes that the efficiency-based thresholds should be applied to individual projects with caution. As explained herein, lead agencies may determine that the efficiency-based GHG thresholds for individual land use projects may not be appropriate for very large projects. If there is a fair argument that the project's emissions on a mass level will have a cumulatively considerable impact on the region's GHG emissions, the insignificance presumption afforded to a project that meets an efficiency-based GHG threshold would be overcome.

### 2.3 JUSTIFICATION AND SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THRESHOLDS

BAAQMD's approach to developing a threshold of significance for GHG emissions is to identify the emissions level for which a project would not be expected to substantially conflict with existing California legislation adopted to reduce statewide GHG emissions.

If a project would generate GHG emissions above the threshold level, it would be considered to contribute substantially to a cumulative impact, and would be considered significant. If mitigation can be applied to lessen the emissions such that the project meets its share of emission reductions needed to address the cumulative impact, the project would normally be considered less than significant.

As explained in the District's *Revised Draft Options and Justifications Report* (BAAQMD 2009), there are several types of thresholds that may be supported by substantial evidence and be consistent with existing California legislation and policy to reduce statewide GHG emissions. In determining which thresholds to recommend, Staff studied numerous options, relying on reasonable, environmentally conservative assumptions on growth in the land use sector, predicted emissions reductions from statewide regulatory measures and resulting emissions inventories, and the efficacies of GHG mitigation measures. The thresholds recommended herein were chosen based on the substantial evidence that such thresholds represent quantitative and/or qualitative levels of GHG emissions, compliance with which means that the environmental impact of the GHG emissions will normally not be cumulatively considerable under CEQA. Compliance with such thresholds will be part of the solution to the cumulative GHG emissions problem, rather than hinder the state's ability to meet its goals of reduced statewide GHG emissions. Staff notes that it does not believe there is only one threshold for GHG emissions that can be supported by substantial evidence.

GHG CEQA significance thresholds recommended herein are intended to serve as interim levels during the implementation of the AB 32 Scoping Plan and SB 375, which will occur over time. Until AB 32 has been fully implemented in terms of adopted regulations, incentives, and programs and until SB 375 required plans have been fully adopted, or the California Air Resources Board (ARB) adopts a recommended threshold, the BAAQMD recommends that local agencies in the Bay Area apply the GHG thresholds recommended herein.

If left unchecked, GHG emissions from new land use development in California will result in a cumulatively considerable amount of GHG emissions and a substantial conflict with the State's ability to meet the goals within AB 32. Thus, BAAQMD proposes to adopt interim GHG thresholds for CEQA analysis, which can be used by lead agencies within the Bay Area. This would help lead agencies navigate this dynamic regulatory and technological environment where the field of analysis has remained wide open and inconsistent. BAAQMD's framework for developing a GHG threshold for land development projects that is based on policy and substantial evidence follows.

### **2.3.1 SCIENTIFIC AND REGULATORY JUSTIFICATION**

#### *Climate Science Overview*

Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), hydrofluorocarbons, chlorofluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and have led to a

trend of unnatural warming of the earth's climate, known as global climate change or global warming. It is *extremely unlikely* that global climate change of the past 50 years can be explained without the contribution from human activities (IPCC 2007a).

According to Article 2 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), "Avoiding Dangerous Climate Change" means: "*stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.*" Dangerous climate change defined in the UNFCCC is based on several key indicators including the potential for severe degradation of coral reef systems, disintegration of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet, and shut down of the large-scale, salinity- and thermally-driven circulation of the oceans. (UNFCCC 2009). The global atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide has increased from a pre-industrial value of about 280 ppm to 379 ppm in 2005 (IPCC 2007a). "Avoiding dangerous climate change" is generally understood to be achieved by stabilizing global average temperatures between 2 and 2.4°C above pre-industrial levels. In order to limit temperature increases to this level, ambient global CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations must stabilize between 350 and 400 ppm (IPCC 2007b).

#### ***Executive Order S-3-05***

Executive Order S-3-05, which was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2005, proclaims that California is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. It declares that increased temperatures could reduce the Sierra's snowpack, further exacerbate California's air quality problems, and potentially cause a rise in sea levels. To combat those concerns, the Executive Order established total GHG emission targets. Specifically, emissions are to be reduced to the 2000 level by 2010, the 1990 level by 2020, and to 80 percent below the 1990 level by 2050.

#### ***Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006***

In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which set the 2020 greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal into law. AB 32 finds and declares that "Global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California." AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020, and establishes regulatory, reporting, voluntary, and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions to meet the statewide goal.

In December of 2008, ARB adopted its *Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan)*, which is the State's plan to achieve GHG reductions in California, as required by AB 32 (ARB 2008). The Scoping Plan contains strategies California will implement to achieve a reduction of 169 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions, or approximately 28 percent from the state's projected 2020 emission level of 596 MMT of CO<sub>2</sub>e under a business-as-usual scenario (this is a reduction of 42 MMT of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or almost 10 percent, from 2002-2004 average emissions), so that the state can return to 1990 emission levels, as required by AB 32.

While the Scoping Plan establishes the policy intent to control numerous GHG sources through regulatory, incentive, and market means, given the early phase of implementation and the level of control that local CEQA lead agencies have over numerous GHG sources, CEQA is an important and supporting tool in achieving GHG reductions overall in compliance with AB 32. In this spirit, BAAQMD is considering the adoption of thresholds of significance for GHG emissions for stationary source and land use development projects.

### ***Senate Bill 375***

Senate Bill (SB) 375, signed in September 2008, aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG reduction targets, and land use and housing allocation. SB 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or Alternative Planning Strategy (APS), which will prescribe land use allocation in that MPO's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). ARB, in consultation with MPOs, will provide each affected region with reduction targets for GHGs emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in the region for the years 2020 and 2035. These reduction targets will be updated every eight years, but can be updated every four years if advancements in emission technologies affect the reduction strategies to achieve the targets. ARB is also charged with reviewing each MPO's SCS or APS for consistency with its assigned targets. If MPOs do not meet the GHG reduction targets, transportation projects would not be eligible for State funding programmed after January 1, 2012. New provisions of CEQA would incentivize qualified projects that are consistent with an approved SCS or APS, categorized as "transit priority projects."

While SB 375 is considered in the development of these thresholds, given that the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) development of the SCS for the Bay Area is in its early stages and the ARB GHG reduction target for light duty and passenger vehicles in the Bay Area has not yet been proposed, it is not appropriate from a CEQA perspective to expect SB 375 to completely address the emission reductions needed from this transportation sector in meeting AB 32 goals. In the future, as SB 375 implementation progresses, BAAQMD may need to revisit GHG thresholds.

## **2.3.2 PROJECT-LEVEL GHG THRESHOLDS**

Staff recommends setting GHG significance thresholds based on AB 32 GHG emission reduction goals while taking into consideration emission reduction strategies outlined in ARB's Scoping Plan. Staff proposes two quantitative thresholds for land use projects: a bright line threshold based on a "gap" analysis and an efficiency threshold based on emission levels required to be met in order to achieve AB 32 goals.

Staff also proposes one qualitative threshold for land use projects: if a project complies with a Qualified Climate Action Plan (as defined in Section 2.3.4 below) that addresses the project it would be considered less than significant. As explained in detail in Section 2.3.4 below, compliance with a Qualified Climate Action Plan (or similar adopted policies, ordinances and programs), would provide the evidentiary basis for making

CEQA findings that development consistent with the plan would result in feasible, measureable, and verifiable GHG reductions consistent with broad state goals such that projects approved under qualified Climate Action Plans or equivalent demonstrations would achieve their fair share of GHG emission reductions.

### **2.3.2.1 LAND USE PROJECTS “GAP-BASED” THRESHOLD**

Staff took eight steps in developing this threshold approach, which are summarized here and detailed in the sections that follow. It should be noted that the “gap-based approach” used for threshold development is a conservative approach that focuses on a limited set of state mandates that appear to have the greatest potential to reduce land use development-related GHG emissions at the time of this writing. It is also important to note that over time, as the effectiveness of the State’s implementation of AB 32 (and SB 375) progresses, BAAQMD will need to reconsider the extent of GHG reductions needed over and above those from the implementation thereof for the discretionary approval of land use development projects. Although there is an inherent amount of uncertainty in the estimated capture rates (i.e., frequency at which project-generated emissions would exceed a threshold and would be subject to mitigation under CEQA) and the aggregate emission reductions used in the gap analysis, they are based on BAAQMD’s expertise, the best available data, and use conservative assumptions for the amount of emission reductions from legislation in derivation of the gap (e.g., only adopted legislation was relied upon). This approach is intended to attribute an appropriate share of GHG emission reductions necessary to reach AB 32 goals to new land use development projects in BAAQMD’s jurisdiction that are evaluated pursuant to CEQA.

Step 1 Estimate from ARB’s statewide GHG emissions inventory the growth in emissions between 1990 and 2020 attributable to “land use-driven” sectors of the emission inventory as defined by OPR’s guidance document (*CEQA and Climate Change*). Land use-driven emission sectors include Transportation (On-Road Passenger Vehicles; On-Road Heavy Duty), Electric Power (Electricity; Cogeneration), Commercial and Residential (Residential Fuel Use; Commercial Fuel Use) and Recycling and Waste (Domestic Waste Water Treatment).

Result: 1990 GHG emissions were 295.53 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr and projected 2020 business-as-usual GHG emissions would be 400.22 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr; thus a 26.2 percent reduction from statewide land use-driven GHG emissions would be necessary to meet the AB 32 goal of returning to 1990 emission levels by 2020. (See Table 2)

Step 2 Estimate the anticipated GHG emission reductions affecting the same land use-driven emissions inventory sectors associated with adopted statewide regulations identified in the AB 32 Scoping Plan.

Result: Estimated a 23.9 percent reduction can be expected in the land use-driven GHG emissions inventory from adopted Scoping Plan regulations, including AB 1493 (Pavley), LCFS, Heavy/Medium Duty Efficiency, Passenger Vehicle Efficiency, Energy-Efficiency

Measures, Renewable Portfolio Standard, and Solar Roofs. (See Table 3)

Step 3 Determine any short fall or “gap” between the 2020 statewide emission inventory estimates and the anticipated emission reductions from adopted Scoping Plan regulations. This “gap” represents additional GHG emission reductions needed statewide from the land use-driven emissions inventory sectors, which represents new land use development’s share of the emission reductions needed to meet statewide GHG emission reduction goals.

Result: With the 23.9 percent reductions from AB 32 Scoping Measures, there is a “gap” of 2.3 percent in necessary additional GHG emissions reductions to meet AB 32 goals of a 26.2 percent reduction from statewide land use-driven GHG emissions to return to 1990 levels in 2020. (See Table 2)

Step 4 Determine the percent reduction this “gap” represents in the “land use-driven” emissions inventory sectors from BAAQMD’s 2020 GHG emissions inventory. Identify the mass of emission reductions needed in the SFBAAB from land use-driven emissions inventory sectors.

Result: Estimated that a 2.3 percent reduction in BAAQMD’s projected 2020 emissions projections requires emissions reductions of 1.6 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr from the land use-driven sectors. (See Table 4)

Step 5 Assess BAAQMD’s historical CEQA database (2001-2008) to determine the frequency distribution trend of project sizes and types that have been subject to CEQA over the past several years.

Result: Determined historical patterns of residential, commercial and industrial development by ranges of average sizes of each development type. Results were used in Step 6 below to distribute anticipated Bay Area growth among different future project types and sizes.

Step 6 Forecast new land use development for the Bay Area using DOF/EDD population and employment projections and distribute the anticipated growth into appropriate land use types and sizes needed to accommodate the anticipated growth (based on the trend analysis in Step 5 above). Translate the land use development projections into land use categories consistent with those contained in the Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS).

Result: Based on population and employment projections and the trend analysis from Step 5 above, forecasted approximately 4,000 new development projects, averaging about 400 projects per year through 2020 in the Bay Area.

Step 7 Estimate the amount of GHG emissions from each land use development project type and size using URBEMIS and post-model manual calculation methods (for emissions not included in URBEMIS). Determine the amount of GHG emissions that can reasonably and feasibly be reduced through currently available mitigation measures (“mitigation effectiveness”) for future land use development projects subject to CEQA (based on land use development projections and frequency distribution from Step 6 above).

Result: Based on the information available and on sample URBEMIS calculations, found that mitigation effectiveness of between 25 and 30 percent is feasible.

Step 8 Conduct a sensitivity analysis of the numeric GHG mass emissions threshold needed to achieve the desired emissions reduction (i.e., “gap”) determined in Step 4. This mass emission GHG threshold is that which would be needed to achieve the emission reductions necessary by 2020 to meet the Bay Area’s share of the statewide “gap” needed from the land use-driven emissions inventory sectors.

Result: The results of the sensitivity analysis conducted in Step 8 found that reductions between about 125,000 MT/yr (an aggregate of 1.3 MMT in 2020) and over 200,000 MT/yr (an aggregate of over 2.0 MMT in 2020) were achievable and feasible. A mass emissions threshold of 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr would result in approximately 59 percent of all projects being above the significance threshold (e.g., this is approximately the operational GHG emissions that would be associated with a 60 residential unit subdivision) and must implement feasible mitigation measures to meet CEQA requirements. With an estimated 26 percent mitigation effectiveness, the 1,100 MT threshold would achieve 1.6 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr in GHG emissions reductions.

### **2.3.2.2 DETAILED BASIS AND ANALYSIS**

#### ***Derivation of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goal***

To meet the target emissions limit established in AB 32 (equivalent to levels in 1990), total GHG emissions would need to be reduced by approximately 28 percent from projected 2020 forecasts (ARB 2009a). The AB 32 Scoping Plan is ARB’s plan for meeting this mandate (ARB 2008). While the Scoping Plan does not specifically identify GHG emission reductions from the CEQA process for meeting AB 32 derived emission limits, the scoping plan acknowledges that “other strategies to mitigate climate change . . . should also be explored.” The Scoping Plan also acknowledges that “Some of the measures in the plan may deliver more emission reductions than we expect; others less . . . and new ideas and strategies will emerge.” In addition, climate change is considered a significant environmental issue and, therefore, warrants consideration under CEQA. SB 97 represents the State Legislature’s confirmation of this fact, and it directed the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop CEQA Guidelines for

evaluation of GHG emissions impacts and recommend mitigation strategies. In response, OPR released the *Technical Advisory: CEQA and Climate Change* (OPR 2008), and has released proposed CEQA guidelines (April 14, 2009) for consideration of GHG emissions. It is known that new land use development must also do its fair share toward achieving AB 32 goals (or, at a minimum, should not hinder the State's progress toward the mandated emission reductions).

***Foreseeable Scoping Plan Measures Emission Reductions and Remaining "Gap"***

Step 1 of the Gap Analysis entailed estimating from ARB's statewide GHG inventory the growth in emissions between 1990 and 2020 attributable to land use driven sectors of the emissions inventory. As stated above, to meet the requirements set forth in AB 32 (i.e., achieve California's 1990-equivalent GHG emissions levels by 2020) California would need to achieve an approximate 28 percent reduction in emissions across all sectors of the GHG emissions inventory compared with 2020 projections. However, to meet the AB 32 reduction goals in the emissions sectors that are related to land use development (e.g., on-road passenger and heavy-duty motor vehicles, commercial and residential area sources [i.e., natural gas], electricity generation/consumption, wastewater treatment, and water distribution/consumption), staff determined that California would need to achieve an approximate 26 percent reduction in GHG emissions from these land use-driven sectors (ARB 2009a) by 2020 to return to 1990 land use emission levels.

Next, in Step 2 of the Gap Analysis, Staff determined the GHG emission reductions within the land use-driven sectors that are anticipated to occur from implementation of the Scoping Plan measures statewide, which are summarized in Table 2 and described below. Since the GHG emission reductions anticipated with the Scoping Plan were not accounted for in ARB's or BAAQMD's 2020 GHG emissions inventory forecasts (i.e., business as usual), an adjustment was made to include (i.e., give credit for) GHG emission reductions associated with key Scoping Plans measures, such as the Renewable Portfolio Standard, improvements in energy efficiency through periodic updates to Title 24, AB 1493 (Pavley) (which recently received a federal waiver to allow it to be enacted in law), the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), and other measures. With reductions from these State regulations (Scoping Plan measures) taken into consideration and accounting for an estimated 23.9 percent reduction in GHG emissions, in Step 3 of the Gap Analysis Staff determined that the Bay Area would still need to achieve an additional 2.3 percent reduction from projected 2020 GHG emissions to meet the 1990 GHG emissions goal from the land-use driven sectors. This necessary 2.3 percent reduction in projected GHG emissions from the land use sector is the "gap" the Bay Area needs to fill to do its share to meet the AB 32 goals. Refer to the following explanation and Tables 2 through 4 for data used in this analysis.

Because the transportation sector is the largest emissions sector of the state's GHG emissions inventory, it is aggressively targeted in early actions and other priority actions in the Scoping Plan including measures concerning gas mileage (Pavley), fuel carbon intensity (LCFS) and vehicle efficiency measures.

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

<b>Table 2 – California 1990, 2002-2004, and 2020 Land Use Sector GHG<sup>1</sup> (MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr)</b>				
Sector	1990 Emissions	2002-2004 Average	2020 BAU Emissions Projections	% of 2020 Total
<b>Transportation</b>	<b>137.98</b>	<b>168.66</b>	<b>209.06</b>	<b>52%</b>
On-Road Passenger Vehicles	108.95	133.95	160.78	40%
On-Road Heavy Duty	29.03	34.69	48.28	12%
<b>Electric Power</b>	<b>110.63</b>	<b>110.04</b>	<b>140.24</b>	<b>35%</b>
Electricity	95.39	88.97	107.40	27%
Cogeneration <sup>2</sup>	15.24	21.07	32.84	8%
<b>Commercial and Residential</b>	<b>44.09</b>	<b>40.96</b>	<b>46.79</b>	<b>12%</b>
Residential Fuel Use	29.66	28.52	32.10	8%
Commercial Fuel Use	14.43	12.45	14.63	4%
<b>Recycling and Waste<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>4.19</b>	<b>1%</b>
Domestic Wastewater Treatment	2.83	3.39	4.19	1%
<b>TOTAL GROSS EMISSIONS</b>	<b>295.53</b>	<b>323.05</b>	<b>400.22</b>	
% Reduction Goal from Statewide land use driven sectors (from 2020 levels to reach 1990 levels in these emission inventory sectors)			26.2%	
% Reduction from AB32 Scoping Plan measures applied to land use sectors (see Table 3)			-23.9%	
% Reduction needed statewide beyond Scoping Plan measures (Gap)			2.3%	
Notes: MMT CO <sub>2</sub> e /yr = million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions per year.				
<sup>1</sup> Landfills not included. See text.				
<sup>2</sup> Cogeneration included due to many different applications for electricity, in some cases provides substantial power for grid use, and because electricity use served by cogeneration is often amenable to efficiency requirements of local land use authorities.				
Sources: Data compiled by EDAW and ICF Jones & Stokes from ARB data.				

Pavley Regulations. The AB 32 Scoping Plan assigns an approximate 20 percent reduction in emissions from passenger vehicles associated with the implementation of AB 1493. The AB 32 Scoping Plan also notes that “AB 32 specifically states that if the Pavley regulations do not remain in effect, ARB shall implement alternative regulations to control mobile sources to achieve equivalent or greater reductions of greenhouse gas emissions (HSC §38590).” Thus, it is reasonable to assume full implementation of AB 1493 standards, or equivalent programs that would be implemented by ARB. While the Obama administration has proposed national CAFE standards that may be equivalent to or even surpass AB 1493, the timing for implementation of the proposed federal standards is uncertain such that development of thresholds based on currently unadopted federal standards would be premature. BAAQMD may need to revisit this methodology as the federal standards come on line, particularly if such standards are more aggressive than that forecast under state law.

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

<b>Table 3 – 2020 Land Use Sector GHG Emission Reductions from State Regulations and AB 32 Measures</b>				
<b>Affected Emissions Source</b>	<b>California Legislation</b>	<b>% Reduction from 2020 GHG inventory</b>	<b>End Use Sector (% of Bay Area LU Inventory)</b>	<b>Scaled % Emissions Reduction (credit)</b>
Mobile	AB 1493 (Pavley)	19.7%	On road passenger/light truck transportation (45%)	8.9%
	LCFS	7.2%	On road passenger/light truck transportation (45%)	3.2%
	LCFS	7.2%	On road Heavy/Medium Duty Transportation (5%)	0.4%
	Heavy/Medium Duty Efficiency	2.9%	On road Heavy/Medium Duty Transportation (5%)	0.2%
	Passenger Vehicle Efficiency	2.8%	On road passenger/light truck transportation (45%)	1.3%
Area	Energy-Efficiency Measures	9.5%	Natural gas (Residential, 10%)	1.0%
			Natural gas (Non-residential, 13%)	1.2%
Indirect	Renewable Portfolio Standard	21.0%	Electricity (excluding cogen) (17%)	3.5%
	Energy-Efficiency Measures	15.7%	Electricity (26%)	4.0%
	Solar Roofs	1.5%	Electricity (excluding cogen) (17%)	0.2%
<b>Total credits given to land use-driven emission inventory sectors from Scoping Plan measures</b>				<b>23.9%</b>
Notes: AB = Assembly Bill; LCFS = Low Carbon Fuel Standard; SB = Senate Bill; RPS = Renewable Portfolio Standard				
Please refer to Appendix D for detailed calculations. Sources: Data compiled by ICF Jones & Stokes.				

LCFS. According to the adopted LCFS rule (CARB, April 2009), the LCFS is expected to result in approximately 10 percent reduction in the carbon intensity of transportation fuels. However, a portion of the emission reductions required from the LCFS would be achieved over the life cycle of transportation fuel production rather than from mobile-source emission factors. Based on CARB’s estimate of nearly 16 MMT reductions in on-road emissions from implementation of the LCFS and comparison to the statewide on-road emissions sector, the LCFS is assumed to result in a 7.2 percent reduction compared to 2020 BAU conditions (CARB 2009e).

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

<b>Table 4 – SFBAAB 1990, 2007, and 2020 Land Use Sector GHG Emissions Inventories and Projections (MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr)</b>				
Sector	1990 Emissions	2007 Emissions	2020 Emissions Projections	% of 2020 Total <sup>2</sup>
<b>Transportation</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>30.8</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>50%</b>
On-Road Passenger Vehicles	23.0	27.5	32.0	
On-Road Heavy Duty	3.1	3.3	3.7	
<b>Electric Power</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>26%</b>
Electricity	16.5	9.9	11.8	
Cogeneration	8.6	5.3	6.4	
<b>Commercial and Residential</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>24%</b>
Residential Fuel Use	5.8	7.0	7.5	
Commercial Fuel Use	3.1	8.0	9.3	
<b>Recycling and Waste<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1%</b>
Domestic Waste Water Treatment	0.2	0.4	0.4	
<b>TOTAL GROSS EMISSIONS</b>	<b>60.3</b>	<b>61.4</b>	<b>71.1</b>	
SFBAAB's "Fair Share" % Reduction (from 2020 levels to reach 1990 levels) with AB-32 Reductions (from Table 3)			2.3%	
SFBAAB's Equivalent Mass Emissions Land Use Reduction Target at 2020 (MMT CO <sub>2</sub> e/yr)			1.6	
Notes: MMT CO <sub>2</sub> e /yr = million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions per year; SFBAAB = San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.				
<sup>1</sup> Landfills not included.				
<sup>2</sup> Percentages do not sum exactly to 100% in table due to rounding.				
Please refer to Appendix D for detailed calculations.				
Sources: Data compiled by EDAW 2009, ICF Jones & Stokes 2009, BAAQMD 2008.				

Renewable Portfolio Standard, Energy Efficiency and Solar Roofs. Energy efficiency and renewable energy measures from the Scoping Plan were also included in the gap analysis. The Renewable Portfolio Standard (rules) will require the renewable energy portion of the retail electricity portfolio to be 33 percent in 2020. For PG&E, the dominant electricity provider in the Basin, approximately 12 percent of their current portfolio qualifies under the RPS rules and thus the gain by 2020 would be approximately 21 percent. The Scoping Plan also estimates that energy efficiency gains with periodic improvement in building and appliance energy standards and incentives will reach 10 to 15 percent for natural gas and electricity respectively. The final state measure included in this gap analysis is the solar roof initiative, which is estimated to result in reduction of the overall electricity inventory of 1.5 percent.

Landfill emissions are excluded from this analysis. While land use development does generate waste related to both construction and operations, the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) has mandatory diversion requirements that will, in all probability, increase over time to promote waste reductions, reuse, and recycle. The Bay Area has relatively high levels of waste diversion and extensive recycling efforts. Further, ARB has established and proposes to increase methane capture requirements for all major landfills. Thus, at this time, landfill emissions associated with land use

development waste generation is not included in the land use sector inventory used to develop this threshold approach.

Industrial stationary sources thresholds were developed separately from the land use threshold development using a market capture approach as described below. However, mobile source and area source emissions, as well as indirect electricity emissions that derive from industrial use are included in the land use inventory above as these particular activities fall within the influence of local land use authorities in terms of the affect on trip generation and energy efficiency.

AB 32 mandates reduction to 1990-equivalent GHG levels by 2020, with foreseeable emission reductions from State regulations and key Scoping Plan measures taken into account, were applied to the land use-driven emission sectors within the SFBAAB (i.e., those that are included in the quantification of emissions from a land use project pursuant to a CEQA analysis [on-road passenger vehicles, commercial and residential natural gas, commercial and residential electricity consumption, and domestic waste water treatment], as directed by OPR in the Technical Advisory: *Climate Change and CEQA* [OPR 2008]). This translates to a 2.3 percent gap in necessary GHG emission reductions by 2020 from these sectors.

### **2.3.2.3 LAND USE PROJECTS BRIGHT LINE THRESHOLD**

In Steps 4 and 5 of the gap analysis, Staff determined that applying a 2.3 percent reduction to these land use emissions sectors in the SFBAAB's GHG emissions inventory would result in an equivalent fair share of 1.6 million metric tons per year (MMT/yr) reductions in GHG emissions from new land use development. As additional regulations and legislation aimed at reducing GHG emissions from land use-related sectors become available in the future, the 1.6 MMT GHG emissions reduction goal may be revisited and recalculated by BAAQMD.

In order to derive the 1.6 MMT "gap," a projected development inventory for the next ten years in the SFBAAB was calculated. (See Table 4 and *Revised Draft Options and Justifications Report* (BAAQMD 2009).) CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions were modeled for projected development in the SFBAAB and compiled to estimate the associated GHG emissions inventory. The GHG (i.e., CO<sub>2</sub>e) CEQA threshold level was adjusted for projected land use development that would occur within BAAQMD's jurisdiction over the period from 2010 through 2020.

Projects with emissions greater than the threshold would be required to mitigate to the threshold level or reduce project emissions by a percentage (mitigation effectiveness) deemed feasible by the Lead Agency under CEQA compared to a base year condition. The base year condition is defined by an equivalent size and character of project with annual emissions using the defaults in URBEMIS and the California Climate Action Registry's General Reporting Protocol for 2008. By this method, land use project mitigation subject to CEQA would help close the "gap" remaining after application of the key regulations and measures noted above supporting overall AB 32 goals.

This threshold takes into account Steps 1-8 of the gap analysis described above to arrive at a numerical mass emissions threshold. Various mass emissions significance threshold levels (i.e., bright lines) could be chosen based on the mitigation effectiveness and performance anticipated to be achieved per project to meet the aggregate emission reductions of 1.6 MMT needed in the SFBAAB by 2020. (See Table 5 and *Revised Draft Options and Justifications Report* (BAAQMD 2009).) Staff recommends a 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year threshold. Choosing a 1,100 MT mass emissions significance threshold level (equivalent to approximately 60 single-family units), would result in about 59 percent of all projects being above the significance threshold and having to implement feasible mitigation measures to meet their CEQA obligations. These projects account for approximately 92 percent of all GHG emissions anticipated to occur between now and 2020 from new land use development in the SFBAAB.

Project applicants and lead agencies could use readily available computer models to estimate a project's GHG emissions, based on project specific attributes, to determine if they are above or below the bright line numeric threshold. With this threshold, projects that are above the threshold level, after consideration of emission-reducing characteristics of the project as proposed, would have to reduce their emissions to below the threshold to be considered less than significant.

Establishing a "bright line" to determine the significance of a project's GHG emissions impact provides a level of certainty to lead agencies in determining if a project needs to reduce its GHG emissions through mitigation measures and when an EIR is required.

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

Table 5 – Operational GHG Threshold Sensitivity Analysis									
Mitigation Effectiveness Assumptions									
Option	Performance Standards Applied to All Projects with Emissions < Threshold Level	Mitigation Effectiveness Applied to Emissions > Threshold Level	Mass Emission Threshold Level (MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/yr)	% of Projects Captured (>threshold)	% of Emissions Captured (> threshold)	Emissions Reduction per year (MT/yr)	Aggregate Emissions Reduction (MMT) at 2020	Threshold Project Size Equivalent (single family dwelling units)	
1A	N/A	30%	975	60%	93%	201,664	2.0	53	
1A	N/A	25%	110	96%	100%	200,108	2.0	66	
1A	N/A	30%	1,225	21%	67%	159,276	1.6	67	
1A	N/A	26%	1,100	59%	92%	159,877	1.6	60	
1A	N/A	30%	2,000	14%	61%	143,418	1.4	109	
1A	N/A	25%	1,200	58%	92%	136,907	1.4	66	
1A	N/A	30%	3,000	10%	56%	127,427	1.3	164	
1A	N/A	25%	1,500	20%	67%	127,303	1.3	82	
1B	26%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	208,594	2.1	N/A <sup>1</sup>	
1C	5%	30%	1,900	15%	62%	160,073	1.6	104	
1C	10%	25%	1,250	21%	67%	159,555	1.6	68	
1C	5%	30%	3,000	10%	56%	145,261	1.5	164	
1C	10%	25%	2,000	4%	61%	151,410	1.5	109	
1C	10%	30%	10,000	2%	33%	125,271	1.3	547	

Notes: MMT = million metric tons per year; MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions per year; MT/yr = metric tons per year; N/A = not applicable.

<sup>1</sup> Any project subject to CEQA would trigger this threshold.

Please refer to Appendix E for detailed calculations.

Source: Data modeled by ICF Jones & Stokes.

**2.3.2.4 LAND USE PROJECTS EFFICIENCY-BASED THRESHOLD**

GHG efficiency metrics can also be utilized as thresholds to assess the GHG efficiency of a project on a per capita basis (residential only projects) or on a “service population” basis (the sum of the number of jobs and the number of residents provided by a project) such that the project will allow for consistency with the goals of AB 32 (i.e., 1990 GHG emissions levels by 2020). GHG efficiency thresholds can be determined by dividing the GHG emissions inventory goal (allowable emissions), by the estimated 2020 population and employment. This method allows highly efficient projects with higher mass emissions to meet the overall reduction goals of AB 32. Staff believes it is more appropriate to base the land use efficiency threshold on the service population metric for the land use-driven emission inventory. This approach is appropriate because the threshold can be applied evenly to all project types (residential or commercial/retail only and mixed use) and uses only the land use emissions inventory that is comprised of all land use projects. Staff will provide the methodology to calculate a project’s GHG emissions in the revised CEQA Guidelines, such as allowing infill projects up to a 50 percent or more reduction in daily vehicle trips if the reduction can be supported by close proximity to transit and support services, or a traffic study prepared for the project.

<b>Table 6 – California 2020 GHG Emissions, Population Projections and GHG Efficiency Thresholds - Land Use Inventory Sectors</b>	
Land Use Sectors Greenhouse Gas Emissions Target	295,530,000
Population	44,135,923
Employment	20,194,661
California Service Population (Population + Employment)	64,330,584
AB 32 Goal GHG emissions (metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> e)/SP <sup>1</sup>	<b>4.6</b>
Notes: AB = Assembly Bill; CO <sub>2</sub> e = carbon dioxide equivalent; GHG = greenhouse gas; SP = service population.	
<sup>1</sup> Greenhouse gas efficiency levels were calculated using only the “land use-related” sectors of ARB’s emissions inventory.	
Please refer to Appendix D for detailed calculations.	
Sources: Data compiled by EDAW 2009, ARB 2009a, DOF 2009, EDD 2009, ICF Jones & Stokes 2009.	

Staff proposes a project-level efficiency threshold of 4.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/SP, the derivation of which is shown Table 6. This efficiency-based threshold reflects very GHG-efficient projects. As stated previously and below, staff anticipates that significance thresholds (rebuttable presumptions of significance at the project level) will function on an interim basis only until adequate programmatic approaches are in place at the city, county, and regional level that will allow the CEQA streamlining of individual projects. (See Draft CEQA Guidelines, proposed section 15183.5 [“Tiering and Streamlining the Analysis of Greenhouse Gas Emissions”]). In advance of such programmatic approaches, local agencies may wish to apply this efficiency-based recommended threshold with some discretion, taking into account not only the project's efficiency, but also its total GHG emissions. Even where a project is relatively GHG-efficient as compared to other projects, in approving the project, the lead agency is committing to use what is essentially

its GHG "budget" in a given way. Expending this "budget" on the proposed project may affect other development opportunities and associated obligations to mitigate or conflict with other actions that the community may wish to take to reduce its overall GHG emissions after it has conducted its programmatic analysis.

Accordingly, in applying the efficiency-based threshold of 4.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/SP, the lead agency might also wish to consider the project's total emissions. Where a project meets the efficiency threshold but would still have very large GHG emissions, the lead agency may wish to consider whether the project's contributions to climate change might still be cumulatively considerable and whether additional changes to the project or mitigation should be required. Staff notes that even where the project may be significant as it relates to climate change, the lead agency may find that the project should nonetheless be approved in light of its benefits; in that case, the lead agency may wish to note the project's efficiency and any innovative design features in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

### **2.3.3 PLAN-LEVEL GHG THRESHOLDS**

Staff proposes using a two step process for determining the significance of proposed plans and plan amendments for GHG. As a first step in assessing plan-level impacts, Staff is proposing that agencies that have adopted a qualified climate action plan (or have incorporated similar criteria in their General Plan) and the General Plan or Transportation Plan are consistent with the climate action plan, the General Plan or Transportation Plan would be considered less than significant. In addition, as discussed above for project-level GHG impacts, Staff is proposing an efficiency threshold to assess plan-level impacts. Staff believes a programmatic approach to limiting GHG emissions is appropriate at the plan-level. Thus, as projects consistent with the climate action plan are proposed, they may be able to tier off the plan and its environmental analysis.

#### **2.3.3.1 GHG EFFICIENCY METRICS FOR PLANS**

For local land use plans, a GHG-efficiency metric (e.g., GHG emissions per unit) would enable comparison of a proposed general plan to its alternatives and to determine if the proposed general plan meets AB 32 emission reduction goals.

AB 32 identifies local governments as essential partners in achieving California's goal to reduce GHG emissions. Local governments have primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit how and where land is developed to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdiction. ARB has developed the Local Government Operations Protocol and is developing a protocol to estimate community-wide GHG emissions. ARB encourages local governments to use these protocols to track progress in reducing GHG emissions. ARB encourages local governments to institutionalize the community's strategy for reducing its carbon footprint in its general plan. SB 375 creates a process for regional integration of land development patterns and transportation infrastructure planning with the primary goal of reducing GHG emissions from the largest sector of the GHG emission inventory, light duty vehicles.

If the statewide AB 32 GHG emissions reduction context is established, GHG efficiency can be viewed independently from the jurisdiction in which the plan is located. Expressing projected 2020 mass of emissions from land use-related emissions sectors by comparison to a demographic unit (e.g., population and employment) provides evaluation of the GHG efficiency of a project in terms of what emissions are allowable while meeting AB 32 targets.

Two approaches were considered for efficiency metrics. The “service population” (SP) approach would consider efficiency in terms of the GHG emissions compared to the sum of the number of jobs and the number of residents at a point in time. The per capita option would consider efficiency in terms of GHG emissions per resident only. Staff recommends that the efficiency threshold for plans be based on all emission inventory sectors because, unlike land use projects, community-wide or regional plans comprise more than just land use related emissions (e.g. industrial). Further, Staff recommends that plan threshold be based on the service population metric as community-wide plans or regional plans include a mix of residents and employees. The Service Population metric would allow decision makers to compare GHG efficiency of general plan alternatives that vary residential and non-residential development totals, encouraging GHG efficiency through improving jobs/housing balance. This approach would not give preference to communities that accommodate more residential (population-driven) land uses than non-residential (employment driven) land uses which could occur with the per capita approach.

A SP-based GHG efficiency metric (see Table 7) was derived from the emission rates at the State level that would accommodate projected population and employment growth under trend forecast conditions, and the emission rates needed to accommodate growth while allowing for consistency with the goals of AB 32 (i.e., 1990 GHG emissions levels by 2020).

<b>Table 7 – California 2020 GHG Emissions, Population Projections and GHG Efficiency Thresholds - All Inventory Sectors</b>	
All Inventory Sectors Greenhouse Gas Emissions Target	426,500,000
Population	44,135,923
Employment	20,194,661
California Service Population (Population + Employment)	64,330,584
AB 32 Goal GHG emissions (metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> e)/SP <sup>1</sup>	<b>6.6</b>
Notes: AB = Assembly Bill; CO <sub>2</sub> e = carbon dioxide equivalent; GHG = greenhouse gas; SP = service population.	
<sup>1</sup> Greenhouse gas efficiency levels were calculated using only the “land use-related” sectors of ARB’s emissions inventory.	
Please refer to Appendix D for detailed calculations.	
Sources: Data compiled by EDAW 2009, ARB 2009a, DOF 2009, EDD 2009, ICF Jones & Stokes 2009.	

If a general plan demonstrates, through dividing the emissions inventory projections (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e) by the amount of growth that would be accommodated in 2020, that it could meet the GHG efficiency metrics proposed in this section (6.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/SP from all emission

sectors, as noted in Table 7), then the amount of GHG emissions associated with the general plan would be considered less than significant, regardless of its size (and magnitude of GHG emissions). In other words, the general plan would accommodate growth in a manner that would not hinder the State's ability to achieve AB 32 goals, and thus, would be less than significant for GHG emissions and their contribution to climate change. The efficiency metric would not penalize well-planned communities that propose a large amount of development. Instead, the SP-based GHG efficiency metric acts to encourage the types of development that BAAQMD and OPR support (i.e., infill and transit-oriented development) because it tends to reduce GHG and other air pollutant emissions overall, rather than discourage large developments for being accompanied by a large mass of GHG emissions. Plans that are more GHG efficient would have no or limited mitigation requirements to help them complete the CEQA process more readily than plans that promote GHG inefficiencies, which will require detailed design of mitigation during the CEQA process and could subject a plan to potential challenge as to whether all feasible mitigation was identified and adopted. This type of threshold can shed light on a well-planned general plan that accommodates a large amount of growth in a GHG-efficient way.

When analyzing long-range plans, such as general plans, it is important to note that the planning horizon will often surpass the 2020 timeframe for implementation of AB 32. Executive Order S-3-05 establishes a more aggressive emissions reduction goal for the year 2050 of 80 percent below 1990 emissions levels. The year 2020 should be viewed as a milestone year, and the general plan should not preclude the community from a trajectory toward the 2050 goal. However, the 2020 timeframe is examined in this threshold evaluation because doing so for the 2050 timeframe (with respect to population, employment, and GHG emissions projections) would be too speculative. Advances in technology and policy decisions at the state level will be needed to meet the aggressive 2050 goals. It is beyond the scope of the analysis tools available at this time to examine reasonable emissions reductions that can be achieved through CEQA analysis in the year 2050. As the 2020 timeframe draws nearer, BAAQMD will need to reevaluate the threshold to better represent progress toward 2050 goals.

### **2.3.4 CLIMATE ACTION PLANS**

Finally, many local agencies have already undergone or plan to undergo efforts to create general or other plans that are consistent with AB 32 goals. The Air District encourages such planning efforts and recognizes that careful upfront planning by local agencies is invaluable to achieving the state's GHG reduction goals. If a project is consistent with an adopted Qualified Climate Action Plan that addresses the project's GHG emissions, it can be presumed that the project will not have significant GHG emission impacts. This approach is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), which provides that a "lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program which provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem."

A qualified Climate Action Plan (or similar adopted policies, ordinances and programs) is one that is consistent with all of the AB 32 Scoping Plan measures and goals. The Climate Action Plan should identify a land use design, transportation network, goals, policies and implementation measures that would achieve AB 32 goals. Plans with horizon years beyond 2020 should consider continuing the downward reduction path set by AB 32 and move toward climate stabilization goals established in Executive Order S-3-05.

### ***Qualified Climate Action Plans***

A qualified Climate Action Plan adopted by a local jurisdiction should include the following. The District's revised CEQA Guidelines will provide the methodology to determine if a Climate Action Plan meets these requirements.

- ▶ GHG Inventory for Current Year and Forecast for 2020 (and for 1990 if the reduction goal is based on 1990 emission levels).
- ▶ An adopted GHG Reduction Goal for 2020 for the jurisdiction from all sources (existing and future) which is at least one of the following: 1990 GHG emission levels, 15 percent below 2008 emission levels, or 28 percent below BAU Forecasts for 2020 (if including non-land use sector emissions in the local inventory; otherwise can use 26.2 percent if only including land use sector emissions).
- ▶ Identification of feasible reduction measures to reduce GHG emissions for 2020 to the identified target.
- ▶ Application of relevant reduction measures included in the AB 32 Scoping Plan that are within the jurisdiction of the local land use authority (such as building energy efficiency, etc.).
- ▶ Quantification of the reduction effectiveness of each of the feasible measures identified including disclosure of calculation method and assumptions.
- ▶ Identification of implementation steps and financing mechanisms to achieve the identified goal by 2020.
- ▶ Procedures for monitoring and updating the GHG inventory and reduction measures at least twice before 2020 or at least every five years.
- ▶ Identification of responsible parties for Implementation.
- ▶ Schedule of implementation.
- ▶ Certified CEQA document, or equivalent process (see below).

### ***Local Climate Action Policies, Ordinances and Programs***

Air District staff recognizes that many communities in the Bay Area have been proactive in planning for climate change but have not yet developed a stand-alone Climate Action

Plan that meets the above criteria. Many cities and counties have adopted climate action policies, ordinances and program that may in fact achieve the goals of a qualified climate action plan. Staff recommends that if a local jurisdiction can demonstrate that its collective set of climate action policies, ordinances and other programs is consistent with AB 32, includes requirements or feasible measures to reduce GHG emissions and achieves one of the following GHG emission reduction goals,<sup>3</sup> the AB 32 consistency demonstration should be considered equivalent to a qualified climate action plan:

- ▶ 1990 GHG emission levels,
- ▶ 15 percent below 2008 emission levels, or
- ▶ 28 percent below BAU Forecasts for 2020 (if including non-land use sector emissions in the local inventory; otherwise can use 26.2 percent if only including land use sector emissions).

Qualified Climate Action Plans that are tied to the AB 32 reduction goals would promote reductions on a plan level without impeding the implementation of GHG-efficient development, and would recognize the initiative of many Bay Area communities who have already developed or are in the process of developing a GHG reduction plan. The details required above for a qualified Climate Action Plan (or similar adopted policies, ordinances and programs) would provide the evidentiary basis for making CEQA findings that development consistent with the plan would result in feasible, measureable, and verifiable GHG reductions consistent with broad state goals such that projects approved under qualified Climate Action Plans or equivalent demonstrations would achieve their fair share of GHG emission reductions.

### **2.3.5 STATIONARY SOURCE GHG THRESHOLD**

Staff's recommended threshold for stationary source GHG emissions is based on estimating the GHG emissions from combustion sources for all permit applications submitted to the Air District in 2005, 2006 and 2007. The analysis is based only on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from stationary sources, as that would cover the vast majority of the GHG emissions due to stationary combustion sources in the SFBAAB. The estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were calculated for the maximum permitted amount, i.e. emissions that would be emitted if the sources applying for a permit application operate at maximum permitted load and for the total permitted hours. All fuel types are included in the estimates. For boilers burning natural gas, diesel fuel is excluded since it is backup fuel and is used only if natural gas is not available. Emission values are estimated before any offsets (i.e., Emission Reduction Credits) are applied. GHG emissions from mobile sources, electricity use and water delivery associated with the operation of the permitted sources are not included in the estimates.

---

<sup>3</sup> Lead agencies using consistency with their jurisdiction's climate action policies, ordinances and programs as a measure of significance under CEQA Guidelines section 15064(h)(3) should ensure that the policies, ordinances and programs satisfy all of the requirements of that subsection before relying on them in a CEQA analysis.

It is projected that a threshold level of 10,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year would capture approximately 95 percent of all GHG emissions from new permit applications from stationary sources in the SFBAAB. That threshold level was calculated as an average of the combined CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from all stationary source permit applications submitted to the Air District during the three year analysis period.

Staff recommends this 10,000 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>/yr as it would address a broad range of combustion sources and thus provide for a greater amount of GHG reductions to be captured and mitigated through the CEQA process. As documented in the Scoping Plan, in order to achieve statewide reduction targets, emissions reductions need to be obtained through a broad range of sources throughout the California economy and this threshold would achieve this purpose. While this threshold would capture 95 percent of the GHG emissions from new permit applications, the threshold would do so by capturing only the large, significant projects. Permit applications with emissions above the 10,000 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>/yr threshold account for less than 10 percent of stationary source permit applications which represent 95 percent of GHG emissions from new permits analyzed during the three year analysis period.

This threshold would be considered an interim threshold and Air District staff will reevaluate the threshold as AB 32 Scoping Plan measures such as cap and trade are more fully developed and implemented at the state level.

### **2.3.6 SUMMARY OF JUSTIFICATION FOR GHG THRESHOLDS**

The bright-line numeric threshold of 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr is a numeric emissions level below which a project's contribution to global climate change would be less than "cumulatively considerable." This emissions rate is equivalent to a project size of approximately 60 single-family dwelling units, and approximately 59 percent of all future projects and 92 percent of all emissions from future projects would exceed this level. For projects that are above this bright-line cutoff level, emissions from these projects would still be less than cumulatively significant if the project as a whole would result in an efficiency of 4.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population or better for mixed-use projects. Projects with emissions above 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr would therefore still be less than significant if they achieved project efficiencies below these levels. If projects as proposed exceed these levels, they would be required to implement mitigation measures to bring them back below the 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr bright-line cutoff or within the 4.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e Service Population efficiency threshold. If mitigation did not bring a project back within the threshold requirements, the project would be cumulatively significant and could be approved only with a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a showing that all feasible mitigation measures have been implemented. Projects' GHG emissions would also be less than significant if they comply with a Qualified Climate Action Plan.

As explained in the preceding analyses of these thresholds, the greenhouse gas emissions from land use projects expected between now and 2020 built in compliance with these thresholds would be approximately 26 percent below BAU 2020 conditions and thus would be consistent with achieving an AB 32 equivalent reduction. The 26 percent

reduction from BAU 2020 from new projects built in conformance with these proposed thresholds would achieve an aggregate reduction of approximately 1.6 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr, which is the level of emission reductions from new Bay Area land use sources needed to meet the AB 32 goals, per ARB's Scoping Plan as discussed above.

Projects with greenhouse gas emissions in conformance with these proposed thresholds would therefore not be considered significant for purposes of CEQA. Although the emissions from such projects would add an incremental amount to the overall greenhouse gas emissions that cause global climate change impacts, emissions from projects consistent with these thresholds would not be a "cumulatively considerable" contribution under CEQA. Such projects would not be "cumulatively considerable" because they would be helping to solve the cumulative problem as a part of the AB 32 process.

California's response to the problem of global climate change is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 under AB 32 as a near-term measure and ultimately to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050 as the long-term solution to stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that will not cause unacceptable climate change impacts. To implement this solution, the Air Resources Board has adopted a Scoping Plan and budgeted emissions reductions that will be needed from all sectors of society in order to reach the interim 2020 target.

The land-use sector in the Bay Area needs to achieve aggregate emission reductions of approximately 1.6 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr from new projects between now and 2020 to achieve this goal, as noted above, and each individual new project will need to achieve its own respective portion of this amount in order for the Bay Area land use sector as a whole to achieve its allocated emissions target. Building all of the new projects expected in the Bay Area between now and 2020 in accordance with the thresholds that District staff are proposing will achieve the overall appropriate share for the land use sector, and building each individual project in accordance with the proposed thresholds will achieve that individual project's respective portion of the emission reductions needed to implement the AB 32 solution. For these reasons, projects built in conformance with the proposed thresholds will be part of the solution to the cumulative problem, and not part of the continuing problem. They will allow the Bay Area's land use sector to achieve the emission reductions necessary from that sector for California to implement its solution to the cumulative problem of global climate change. As such, even though such projects will add an incremental amount of greenhouse gas emissions, their incremental contribution will be less than "cumulatively considerable" because they are helping to achieve the cumulative solution, not hindering it. Such projects will therefore not be "significant" for purposes of CEQA. (*See* CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1).)

The conclusion that land use projects that comply with these proposed thresholds is also supported by CEQA Guidelines Section 15030(a)(3), which provides that a project's contribution to a cumulative problem can be less than cumulatively considerable "if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact." In the case of greenhouse gas emissions associated with land use projects, achieving the amount of emission reductions below BAU that will be required to achieve the AB 32 goals is the project's "fair share" of the

overall emission reductions needed under ARB's scoping plan to reach the overall statewide AB 32 emissions levels for 2020. If a project is designed to implement greenhouse gas mitigation measures that achieve a level of reductions consistent with what is required from all new land use projects to achieve the land use sector "budget" – *i.e.*, keeping overall project emissions below 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr or ensuring that project efficiency is better than 4.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/service population – then it will be implementing its share of the mitigation measures necessary to alleviate the cumulative impact, as shown in the analyses set forth above.

It is also worth noting that this "fair share" approach is flexible and will allow a project's significance to be determined by how well it is designed from a greenhouse-gas efficiency standpoint, and not just by the project's size. For example, a large high-density infill project located in an urban core nearby to public transit and other alternative transportation options, and built using state-of-the-art energy efficiency methods and improvements such as solar panels, as well as all other feasible mitigation measures, would not become significant for greenhouse gas purposes (and thus require a Statement of Overriding Considerations in order to be approved) simply because it happened to be a large project. Projects such as this hypothetical development with low greenhouse-gas emissions per service population are what California will need in the future in order to do its part in achieving a solution to the problem of global climate change. The determination of significance under CEQA should therefore take these factors into account, and staff's proposed significance thresholds would achieve this important policy goal. In all, land use sector projects that comply with the GHG thresholds would not be "cumulatively considerable" because they would be helping to solve the cumulative problem as a part of the AB 32 process.

Likewise, new Air District permit applications for stationary sources that comply with the quantitative threshold of 10,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr would not be "cumulatively considerable" because they also would not hinder the state's ability to solve the cumulative greenhouse gas emissions problem pursuant to AB 32. Unlike the land use sector, the AB 32 Scoping Plan measures, including the cap-and-trade program, provide for necessary emissions reductions from the stationary source sector to achieve AB 32 2020 goals.

While stationary source projects will need to comply with the cap-and-trade program once it is enacted and reduce their emissions accordingly, the program will be phased in over time starting in 2012 and at first will only apply to the very largest sources of GHG emissions. In the mean time, certain stationary source projects, particularly those with large GHG emissions, still will have a cumulatively considerable impact on climate change. The 10,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr threshold will capture 95 percent of the stationary source sector GHG emissions in the Bay Area. The five percent of emissions that are from stationary source projects below the 10,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr threshold account for a small portion of the Bay Area's total GHG emissions from stationary sources and these emissions come from very small projects. Such small stationary source projects will not significantly add to the global problem of climate change, and they will not hinder the Bay Area's ability to reach the AB 32 goal in any significant way, even when considered cumulatively. In Air District's staff's judgment, the potential environmental benefits from

requiring EIRs and mitigation for these projects would be insignificant. In all, based on staff's expertise, stationary source projects with emissions below 10,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr will not provide a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact of climate change.

### **3 COMMUNITY RISK AND HAZARD THRESHOLDS**

To address community risk from air toxics, the Air District initiated the Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) program in 2004 to identify locations with high levels of risk from ambient toxic air contaminants (TAC) co-located with sensitive populations and use the information to help focus mitigation measures. Through the CARE program, the Air District developed an inventory of TAC emissions for 2005 and compiled demographic and health indicator data. According to the findings of the CARE Program, diesel PM—mostly from on and off-road mobile sources—accounts for over 80 percent of the inhalation cancer risk from TACs in the Bay Area (BAAQMD 2006).

The Air District applied a regional air quality model using the 2005 emission inventory data to estimate excess cancer risk from ambient concentrations of important TAC species, including diesel PM, 1,3-butadiene, benzene, formaldehyde and acetaldehyde. The highest cancer risk levels from ambient TAC in the Bay Area tend to occur in the core urban areas, along major roadways and adjacent to freeways and port activity. Cancer risks in areas along these major freeways are estimated to range from 200 to over 500 excess cases in a million for a lifetime of exposure. Priority communities within the Bay Area – defined as having higher emitting sources, highest air concentrations, and nearby low income and sensitive populations – include the urban core areas of Concord, eastern San Francisco, western Alameda County, Redwood City/East Palo Alto, Richmond/San Pablo, and San Jose.

Fifty percent of BAAQMD's population was estimated to have an ambient background inhalation cancer risk of less than 500 cases in one million, based on emission levels in 2005. Table 8 presents a summary of percentages of the population exposed to varying levels of cancer risk from ambient TACs. Approximately two percent of the SFBAAB population is exposed to background risk levels of less than 200 excess cases in one million. This is in contrast to the upper percentile ranges where eight percent of the SFBAAB population is exposed to background risk levels of greater than 1,000 excess cases per one million. To identify and reduce risks from TAC, this chapter presents thresholds of significance for both cancer risk and non-cancer health hazards.

<b>Table 8 – Statistical Summary of Estimated Population-Weighted Ambient Cancer Risk in 2005</b>	
Percentage of Population (Percent below level of ambient risk)	Ambient Cancer Risk (inhalation cancer cases in one million)
92	1,000
90	900
83	800
77	700
63	600
50	500
32	400
13	300
2	200
<1	100

Source: Data compiled by EDAW 2009.

Many scientific studies have linked fine particulate matter and traffic-related air pollution to respiratory illness (Hiltermann et al. 1997, Schikowski et al 2005, Vineis et al. 2007) and premature mortality (Dockery 1993, Pope et al. 1995, Jerrett et al. 2005). Traffic-related air pollution is a complex mix of chemical compounds (Schauer et al. 2006), often spatially correlated with other stressors, such as noise and poverty (Wheeler and Ben-Shlomo 2005). While such correlations can be difficult to disentangle, strong evidence for adverse health effects of fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) has been developed for regulatory applications in a recent consensus-based study by the California Air Resources Board. This study found that a 10 percent increase in PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations increased the non-injury death rate by 10 percent (ARB 2008).

Public Health Officers for four counties in the San Francisco Bay Area in 2009 provided testimony to the Air District’s Advisory Council (February 11, 2009, Advisory Council Meeting on Air Quality and Public Health). Among the recommendations made, was that PM<sub>2.5</sub>, in addition to TACs, be considered in assessments of community-scale impacts of air pollution. In consideration of the scientific studies and recommendations by the Bay Area Health Directors, it is apparent that, in addition to the significance thresholds for local-scale TAC, thresholds of significance are required for near-source, local-scale concentrations of PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

### 3.2 PROPOSED THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Proposed thresholds of significance and Board-requested options are presented in this section:

- The **Staff Proposal** includes thresholds for cancer risk, non-cancer health hazards, and fine particulate matter.

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

- **Board Option 1** includes tiered thresholds for new sources in impacted communities. Thresholds for receptors and cumulative impacts are the same as the Staff Proposal.
- **Board Option 2** removes the option for a qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan from the Staff Proposal.

Proposal/Option	Construction-Related	Operational-Related
<b>Project-Level – Individual Project</b>		
<p><b>Risks and Hazards</b> (Individual Project)</p> <p><u>Staff Proposal</u></p>	<p>Same as Operational Thresholds*</p>	<p><u>All Areas: Siting a New Source or Receptor</u></p> <p>Compliance with Qualified Risk Reduction Plan OR Increased cancer risk of &gt;10.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase: &gt; 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average</p> <p><u>Zone of Influence:</u> 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</p>
<p><b>Risks and Hazards</b> (Individual Project)</p> <p><u>Board Option 1</u></p> <p><b>Tiered Thresholds</b></p>	<p>Same as Operational Thresholds*</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <p>Same as Operational Thresholds*</p>	<p><u>Impacted Communities: Siting a New Source</u></p> <p>Compliance with Qualified Risk Reduction Plan OR Increased cancer risk of &gt;5.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase: &gt; 0.2 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average</p> <p><u>Zone of Influence:</u> 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <p><u>Impacted Communities: Siting a New Receptor</u> <u>All Other Areas: Siting a New Source or Receptor</u></p> <p>Compliance with Qualified Risk Reduction Plan OR Increased cancer risk of &gt;10.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase: &gt; 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average</p> <p><u>Zone of Influence:</u> 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</p>

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

Proposal/Option	Construction-Related	Operational-Related
<p><b>Risks and Hazards</b> (Individual Project)</p> <p><b><u>Board Option 2</u></b></p> <p><b>Quantitative</b> <b>Thresholds</b></p>	<p>Same as Operational Thresholds*</p>	<p><b><u>All Areas:</u></b> <u>Siting a New Source or Receptor</u></p> <p>Increased cancer risk of &gt;10.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase: &gt; 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average</p> <p><b><u>Zone of Influence:</u></b> 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</p>
<p><b>Accidental Release of</b> <b>Acutely Hazardous</b> <b>Air Pollutants</b></p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Storage or use of acutely hazardous materials locating near receptors or receptors locating near stored or used acutely hazardous materials considered significant</p>
<b>Project-Level – Cumulative</b>		
<p><b>Risks and Hazards</b> (Cumulative Thresholds)</p>	<p>Same as Operational Thresholds*</p>	<p><b><u>All Areas:</u></b> <u>Siting a New Source or Receptor</u></p> <p>Compliance with Qualified Risk Reduction Plan OR Cancer: &gt; 100 in a million (from all local sources) Non-cancer: &gt; 1.0 Hazard Index (from all local sources) (Chronic or Acute) <u>PM<sub>2.5</sub>:</u> &gt; 0.8 µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual average (from all local sources)</p> <p><b><u>Zone of Influence:</u></b> 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor</p>
<b>Plan-Level</b>		
<p><b>Plans</b></p>	<p>None</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overlay zones around existing and planned sources of TACs (including adopted Risk Reduction Plan areas) and odors.</li> <li>2. Overlay zones of at least 500 feet (or Air District-approved modeled distance) from all freeways and high volume roadways.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Accidental Release of</b> <b>Acutely Hazardous</b> <b>Air Pollutants</b></p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>

\* Note: The Air District recommends that for construction projects that are less than one year duration, Lead Agencies should annualize impacts over the scope of actual days that peak impacts are to occur, rather than the full year.

### **3.3 JUSTIFICATION AND SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THRESHOLDS**

The goal of the proposed thresholds is to ensure that no source creates, or receptor endures, a significant adverse impact from any individual project, and that the total of all nearby directly emitted risk and hazard emissions is also not significantly adverse. The thresholds for local risks and hazards from TAC and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are intended to apply to all sources of emissions, including both permitted stationary sources and on- and off-road mobile sources, such as sources related to construction, busy roadways, or freight movement.

Thresholds for an individual new source are designed to ensure that the source does not contribute a cumulatively significant impact. Cumulative thresholds for sources recognize that some areas are already near or at levels of significant impact. If within such an area there are receptors, or it can reasonably be foreseen that there will be receptors, then a cumulative significance threshold sets a level beyond which any additional risk is significant.

For new receptors – sensitive populations or the general public – thresholds of significance are designed to identify levels of contributed risk or hazards from existing local sources that pose a significant risk to the receptors. Single-source thresholds for receptors are provided to recognize that within the area defined there can be variations in risk levels that may be significant. Single-source thresholds assist in the identification of significant risks, hazards, or concentrations in a subarea, within the area defined by the selected radius. Cumulative thresholds for receptors are designed to account for the effects of all sources within the defined area.

Cumulative thresholds, for both sources and receptors, must consider the size of the source area, defined by a radius from the proposed project. To determine cumulative impacts from a prescribed zone of influence requires the use of modeling. The larger the radius, the greater the number of sources considered that may contribute to the modeled risk and, until the radius approaches a regional length scale, the greater the expected modeled risk increment. If the area of impact considered were grown to the scale of a city, the modeled risk increment would approach the risk level present in the ambient air.

#### **3.3.1 SCIENTIFIC AND REGULATORY JUSTIFICATION**

##### ***Regulatory Framework for TACs***

Prior to 1990, the Clean Air Act required EPA to list air toxics it deemed hazardous and to establish control standards which would restrict concentrations of hazardous air pollutants (HAP) to a level that would prevent any adverse effects “with an ample margin of safety.” By 1990, EPA had regulated only seven such pollutants and it was widely acknowledged by that time that the original Clean Air Act had failed to address toxic air emissions in any meaningful way. As a result, Congress changed the focus of regulation in 1990 from a risk-based approach to technology-based standards. Title III, Section 112(b) of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendment established this new regulatory approach.

Under this framework, prescribed pollution control technologies based upon maximum achievable control technology (MACT) were installed without the a priori estimation of the health or environmental risk associated with each individual source. The law listed 188 HAPs that would be subject to the MACT standards. EPA issued 53 standards for 89 different types of major industrial sources of air toxics and eight categories of smaller sources such as dry cleaners. These requirements took effect between 1996 and 2002. Under the federal Title V Air Operating Permit Program, a facility with the potential to emit 10 tons of any toxic air pollutant, or 25 tons per year of any combination of toxic air pollutants, is defined as a major source HAPs. Title V permits include requirements for these facilities to limit toxic air pollutant emissions.

Several state and local agencies adopted programs to address gaps in EPA's program prior to the overhaul of the national program in 1990. California's program to reduce exposure to air toxics was established in 1983 by the Toxic Air Contaminant Identification and Control Act (AB 1807, Tanner 1983) and the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act (AB 2588, Connelly 1987). Under AB 1807, ARB and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) determines if a substance should be formally identified as a toxic air contaminant (TAC) in California. OEHHA also establishes associated risk factors and safe concentrations of exposure.

AB 1807 was amended in 1993 by AB 2728, which required ARB to identify the 189 federal hazardous air pollutants as TACs. AB 2588 (Connelly, 1987) supplements the AB 1807 program, by requiring a statewide air toxics inventory, notification of people exposed to a significant health risk, and facility plans to reduce these risks. In September 1992, the "Hot Spots" Act was amended by Senate Bill 1731 which required facilities that pose a significant health risk to the community to reduce their risk through a risk management plan.

### ***Cancer Risk***

Cancer risk from TACs is typically expressed in numbers of excess cancer cases per million persons exposed over a defined period of exposure, for example, over an assumed 70 year lifetime. The Air District is not aware of any agency that has established an acceptable level of cancer risk for TACs. However, a range of what constitutes a significant increment of cancer risk from any compound has been established by the U.S. EPA. EPA's guidance for conducting air toxics analyses and making risk management decisions at the facility- and community-scale level considers a range of acceptable cancer risks from one in a million to one in ten thousand (100 in a million). The guidance considers an acceptable range of cancer risk increments to be from one in a million to one in ten thousand. In protecting public health with an ample margin of safety, EPA strives to provide maximum feasible protection against risks to health from HAPs by limiting additional risk to a level no higher than the one in ten thousand estimated risk that a person living near a source would be exposed to at the maximum pollutant concentrations for 70 years. This goal is described in the preamble to the benzene National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) rulemaking (54 Federal Register 38044, September 14, 1989) and is incorporated by Congress for EPA's residual risk program under Clean Air Act section 112(f).

Regulation 2, Rule 5 of the Air District specifies permit requirements for new and modified stationary sources of TAC. The Project Risk Requirement (2-5-302.1) states that the Air Pollution Control Officer shall deny an Authority to Construct or Permit to Operate for any new or modified source of TACs if the project cancer risk exceeds 10.0 in one million.

#### ***Hazard Index for Non-cancer Health Effects***

Non-cancer health hazards for chronic and acute diseases are expressed in terms of a hazard index (HI), a ratio of TAC concentration to a reference exposure level (REL), below which no adverse health effects are expected, even for sensitive individuals. As such, OEHHA has defined acceptable concentration levels, and also significant concentration increments, for compounds that pose non-cancer health hazards. If the HI for a compound is less than one, non-cancer chronic and acute health impacts have been determined to be less than significant.

#### ***State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards for PM<sub>2.5</sub>***

The Children's Environmental Health Protection Act (Senate Bill 25), passed by the California state legislature in 1999, requires ARB, in consultation with OEHHA, to "review all existing health-based ambient air quality standards to determine whether, based on public health, scientific literature and exposure pattern data, these standards adequately protect the public, including infants and children, with an adequate margin of safety." As a result of the review requirement, in 2002 ARB adopted an annual average California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for PM<sub>2.5</sub> of 12 ug/m<sup>3</sup> that is not to be exceeded (California Code of Regulations, Title 17 § 70200, Table of Standards.) The National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) established an annual standard for PM<sub>2.5</sub> (15 ug/m<sup>3</sup>) that is less stringent than the CAAQS, but also set a 24-hour average standard (35 ug/m<sup>3</sup>), which is not included in the CAAQS (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 50.7).

#### ***Significant Impact Levels for PM<sub>2.5</sub>***

EPA recently proposed and documented alternative options for PM<sub>2.5</sub> Significant Impact Levels (SILs) (Federal Register 40 CFR Parts 51 and 52, September 21, 2007). The EPA is proposing to facilitate implementation of a PM<sub>2.5</sub> Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program in areas attaining the PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS by developing PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments, or SILs. These "increments" are maximum increases in ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations (PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments) allowed in an area above the baseline concentration.

The SIL is a threshold that would be applied to individual facilities that apply for a permit to emit a regulated pollutant in an area that meets the NAAQS. The State and EPA must determine if emissions from that facility will cause the air quality to worsen. If an individual facility projects an increase in emissions that result in ambient impacts greater than the established SIL, the permit applicant would be required to perform additional analyses to determine if those impacts will be more than the amount of the PSD increment. This analysis would combine the impact of the proposed facility when added to all other sources in the area.

The EPA is proposing such values for  $PM_{2.5}$  that will be used as screening tools by a major source subject to PSD to determine the subsequent level of analysis and data gathering required for a PSD permit application for emissions of  $PM_{2.5}$ . The SIL is one element of the EPA program to prevent deterioration in regional air quality and is utilized in the new source review (NSR) process. New source review is required under Section 165 of the Clean Air Act, whereby a permit applicant must demonstrate that emissions from the proposed construction and operation of a facility “will not cause, or contribute to, air pollution in excess of any maximum allowable increase or maximum allowable concentration for any pollutant.” The purpose of the SIL is to provide a screening level that triggers further analysis in the permit application process.

For the purpose of NSR, SILs are set for three types of areas: Class I areas where especially clean air is most desirable, including national parks and wilderness areas; Class II areas where there is not expected to be substantial industrial growth; and Class III areas where the highest relative level of industrial development is expected. In Class II and Class III areas, a  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration of 0.3, 0.8, and  $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  has been proposed as a SIL. To arrive at the SIL  $PM_{2.5}$  option of  $0.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , EPA scaled an established  $PM_{10}$  SILs of  $1.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  by the ratio of emissions of  $PM_{2.5}$  to  $PM_{10}$  using the EPA’s 1999 National Emissions Inventory. To arrive at the SIL option of  $0.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , EPA scaled the  $PM_{10}$  SIL of  $1.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  by the ratio of the current Federal ambient air quality standards for  $PM_{2.5}$  and  $PM_{10}$  (15/50). These options represent what EPA currently considers as a range of appropriate SIL values.

EPA interprets the SIL to be the level of  $PM_{2.5}$  increment that represents a “significant contribution” to regional non-attainment. While SIL options were not designed to be thresholds for assessing community risk and hazards, they are being considered to protect public health at a regional level by helping an area maintain the NAAQS. Furthermore, since it is the goal of the Air District to achieve and maintain the NAAQS and CAAQS at both regional and local scales, the SILs may be reasonably be considered as thresholds of significance under CEQA for local-scale increments of  $PM_{2.5}$ .

### ***Roadway Proximity Health Studies***

Several medical research studies have linked near-road pollution exposure to a variety of adverse health outcomes impacting children and adults. Kleinman et al. (2007) studied the potential of roadway particles to aggravate allergic and immune responses in mice. Using mice that were not inherently susceptible, the researchers placed these mice at various distances downwind of State Road 60 and Interstate 5 freeways in Los Angeles to test the effect these roadway particles have on their immune system. They found that within five meters of the roadway, there was a significant allergic response and elevated production of specific antibodies. At 150 meters (492 feet) and 500 meters (1,640 feet) downwind of the roadway, these effects were not statistically significant.

Another significant study (Ven Hee et al. 2009) conducted a survey involving 3,827 participants that aimed to determine the effect of residential traffic exposure on two preclinical indicators of heart failure; left ventricular mass index (LVMI), measured by the cardiac magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and ejection fraction. The studies

classified participants based on the distance between their residence and the nearest interstate highway, state or local highway, or major arterial road. Four distance groups were defined: less than 50 meters (165 feet), 50-100 meters, 101-150 meters, and greater than 150 meters. After adjusting for demographics, behavioral, and clinical covariates, the study found that living within 50 meters of a major roadway was associated with a 1.4  $\text{g}/\text{m}^2$  higher LVMI than living more than 150 meters from one. This suggests an association between traffic-related air pollution and increased prevalence of a preclinical predictor of heart failure among people living near roadways.

To quantify the roadway concentrations of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  that contributed to the health impacts reported by Kleinman et al (2007), the Air District modeled the emissions and associated particulate matter concentrations for the roadways studied. To perform the modeling, emissions were estimated for Los Angeles using the EMFAC model and annual average vehicle traffic data taken from Caltrans was used in the roadway model (CAL3QHCR) to estimate the downwind  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentrations at 50 meters and 150 meters. Additionally, emissions were assumed to occur from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. corresponding to the time in which the mice were exposed during the study. The results of the modeling indicate that at 150 meters, where no significant health effects were found, the downwind concentration of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  was  $0.78 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , consistent with the proposed EPA SIL option of  $0.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .

#### ***Concentration-Response Function for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$***

In a recent report, ARB reevaluated the relative risk of premature death associated with  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  exposure based on a review of all relevant scientific literature available, and a new relative risk factor was developed (ARB 2008). This consensus-based review found that a  $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  increase in  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentrations increased the risk of premature death by 10 percent (uncertainty interval: 3 percent to 20 percent) and provides a basis for determining the risk increment from an increase in  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration. Twelve experts participated in the study to review the literature and develop the concentration response function. The experts were selected through a two-part peer nomination process, designed to obtain a balanced set of views and included experts in epidemiology, toxicology, and medicine.

The methodologies and results presented in this report were endorsed by scientific advisors from Harvard University, OEHHA, and Brigham Young University. The report underwent an external peer review by experts selected through an independent process involving the University of California at Berkeley, Institute of the Environment. The results of the peer review process were incorporated into the report. Subsequent to the peer review, Schwartz et al. (2008) examined the linearity of the concentration-response function of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ -mortality and showed that the response function is in agreement with Laden et al. (2006) and, moreover, found that this response function was linear down to background levels.

#### ***San Francisco Ordinance on Roadway Proximity Health Effects***

In 2008, the City and County of San Francisco adopted an ordinance (San Francisco Health Code, Article 38 - Air Quality Assessment and Ventilation Requirement for Urban

Infill Residential Development, Ord. 281-08, File No. 080934, December 5, 2008) requiring that public agencies in San Francisco take regulatory action to prevent future air quality health impacts from new sensitive uses proposed near busy roadways (SFDPH 2008). The regulation requires that developers screen sensitive use projects for proximity to traffic and calculate the concentration of  $PM_{2.5}$  from traffic sources where traffic volumes suggest a potential hazard. If modeled levels of traffic-attributable  $PM_{2.5}$  at a project site exceed an action level (currently set at  $0.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) developers would be required to incorporate ventilation systems to remove 80 percent of  $PM_{2.5}$  from outdoor air. The regulation does not place any requirements on proposed sensitive uses if modeled air pollutant levels fall below the action threshold. This ordinance only considers impacts from on-road motor vehicles, not impacts related to construction equipment or stationary sources.

A report with supporting documentation for the ordinance (SFPHD 2008) provided a threshold to trigger action or mitigation of  $0.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  of  $PM_{2.5}$  annual average exposure from roadway vehicles within a 150 meter (492 feet) maximum radius of a sensitive receptor. The report applied the concentration-response function from Jerrett et al. (2005) that attributed 14 percent increase in mortality to a  $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  increase in  $PM_{2.5}$  to estimate an increase in non-injury mortality in San Francisco of about 21 excess deaths per year from a  $0.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  increment of annual average  $PM_{2.5}$ .

#### ***Distance for Significant Impact***

The distance used for the radius around the project boundary should reflect the zone or area over which sources may have a significant influence. For cumulative thresholds, for both sources and receptors, this distance also determines the size of the source area, defined. To determine cumulative impacts from a prescribed zone of influence requires the use of modeling. The larger the radius, the greater the number of sources considered that may contribute to the risk and the greater the expected modeled risk increment. If the area of impact considered were grown to approach the scale of a city, the modeled risk increment would approach the risk level present in the ambient air.

A summary of research findings in ARB's Land Use Compatibility Handbook (ARB 2005) indicates that traffic-related pollutants were higher than regional levels within approximately 1,000 feet downwind and that differences in health-related effects (such as asthma, bronchitis, reduced lung function, and increased medical visits) could be attributed in part to the proximity to heavy vehicle and truck traffic within 300 to 1,000 feet of receptors. In the same summary report, ARB recommended avoiding siting sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center and major rail yard, which supports the use of a 1,000 feet evaluation distance in case such sources may be relevant to a particular project setting. A 1,000 foot zone of influence is also supported by Health & Safety Code §42301.6 (Notice for Possible Source Near School).

Some studies have shown that the concentrations of particulate matter tend to be reduced substantially or can even be indistinguishable from upwind background concentrations at a distance 1,000 feet downwind from sources such as freeways or large distribution centers. Zhu et al. (2002) conducted a systematic ultrafine particle study near Interstate

710, one of the busiest freeways in the Los Angeles Basin. Particle number concentration and size distribution were measured as a function of distances upwind and downwind of the I-710 freeway. Approximately 25 percent of the 12,180 vehicles per hour are heavy duty diesel trucks based on video counts conducted as part of the research. Measurements were taken at 13 feet, 23 feet, 55 feet, 252 feet, 449 feet, and 941 feet downwind and 613 feet upwind from the edge of the freeway. The particle number and supporting measurements of carbon monoxide and black carbon decreased exponentially and all constituents simultaneously tracked with each other as one moves away from the freeway. Ultrafine particle size distribution changed markedly and its number concentrations dropped dramatically with increasing distance. The study found that ultrafine particle concentrations measured 941 feet downwind of I-710 were indistinguishable from the upwind background concentration.

### ***Impacted Communities***

Starting in 2006, the Air District's CARE program developed gridded TAC emissions inventories and compiled demographic information that were used to identify communities that were particularly impacted by toxic air pollution for the purposes of distributing grant and incentive funding. In 2009, the District completed regional modeling of TAC on a one kilometer by one kilometer grid system. This modeling was used to estimate cancer risk and TAC population exposures for the entire District. The information derived from the modeling was then used to update and refine the identification of impacted communities. One kilometer modeling yielded estimates of annual concentrations of five key compounds – diesel particulate matter, benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, and acetaldehyde – for year 2005. These concentrations were multiplied by their respective unit cancer risk factors, as established by OEHHA, to estimate the expected excess cancer risk per million people from these compounds.

Sensitive populations from the 2000 U.S. Census database were identified as youth (under 18) and seniors (over 64) and mapped to the same one kilometer grid used for the toxics modeling. Excess cancers from TAC exposure were determined by multiplying these sensitive populations by the model-estimated excess risk to establish a data set representing sensitive populations with high TAC exposures. TAC emissions (year 2005) were mapped to the one kilometer grid and also scaled by their unit cancer risk factor to provide a data set representing source regions for TAC emissions. Block-group level household income data from the U.S. Census database were used to identify block groups with family incomes where more than 40 percent of the population was below 185 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL). Poverty-level polygons that intersect high (top 50 percent) exposure cells and are within one grid cell of a high emissions cell (top 25 percent) were used to identify impacted areas. Boundaries were constructed along major roads or highways that encompass nearby high emission cells and low income areas. This method identified the following six areas as priority communities: (1) portions of the City of Concord; (2) Western Contra Costa County (including portions of the Cities of Richmond and San Pablo); (3) Western Alameda County along the Interstate-880 corridor (including portions of the Cities of Berkeley, Oakland, San Leandro, San Lorenzo, Hayward; (4) Portions of the City of San Jose. (5) Eastern San Mateo County

(including portions of the Cities of Redwood City and East Palo Alto); and (6) Eastern portions of the City of San Francisco.

### **3.3.2 CONSTRUCTION, LAND USE AND STATIONARY SOURCE RISK AND HAZARD THRESHOLDS**

The proposed options for local risk and hazards thresholds of significance are based on U.S. EPA guidance for conducting air toxics analyses and making risk management decisions at the facility and community-scale level. The thresholds consider reviews of recent health effects studies that link increased concentrations of fine particulate matter to increased mortality. The proposed thresholds would apply to both siting new sources and siting new receptors.

For new sources of TACs, thresholds of significance for a single source are designed to ensure that emissions do not raise the risk of cancer or non-cancer health impacts to cumulatively significant levels. For new sources of PM<sub>2.5</sub>, thresholds are designed to ensure that PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are maintained below state and federal standards in all areas where sensitive receptors or members of the general public live or may foreseeably live, even if at the local- or community-scale where sources of TACs and PM may be nearby.

#### ***Project Radius for Assessing Impacts***

For a project proposing a new source or receptor it is recommended to assess impacts within 1,000 feet, taking into account both its individual and nearby cumulative sources (i.e. proposed project plus existing and foreseeable future projects). Cumulative sources are the combined total risk values of each individual source within the 1,000-foot evaluation zone. A lead agency should enlarge the 1,000-foot radius on a case-by-case basis if an unusually large source or sources of risk or hazard emissions that may affect a proposed project is beyond the recommended radius.

The 1,000 foot radius is consistent with findings in ARB's Land Use Compatibility Handbook (ARB 2005), the Health & Safety Code §42301.6 (Notice for Possible Source Near School), and studies such as that of Zhu et al (2002) which found that concentrations of particulate matter tend to be reduced substantially at a distance 1,000 feet downwind from sources such as freeways or large distribution centers.

#### ***Qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan***

Within the framework of these thresholds, proposed projects would be considered to be less than significant if they are consistent with a qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan (CRRP) adopted by the local jurisdiction with enforceable measures to reduce the community risk. Board Option 2 does not include the CCRP as a significance threshold.

Project proposed in areas where a CRRP has been adopted that are not consistent with the CRRP would be considered to have a significant impact.

Projects proposed in areas where a CRRP has not been adopted and that have the potential to expose sensitive receptors or the general public to emissions-related risk in excess of the thresholds below from any source would be considered to have a significant air quality impact.

The conclusion that land use projects that comply with qualified Community Risk Reduction Plans are less than significant is supported by CEQA Guidelines Sections 15030(a)(3) and 15064(h)(3), which provides that a project's contribution to a cumulative problem can be less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact.

***Increased Cancer Risk to Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI)***

Emissions from a new source or emissions affecting a new receptor would be considered significant where ground-level concentrations of carcinogenic TACs from any source result in an increased cancer risk greater than 10.0 in one million, assuming a 70 year lifetime exposure. Under Board Option 1, within Impacted Communities as defined through the CARE program, the significance level for cancer would be reduced to 5.0 in one million for new sources.

The 10.0 in one million cancer risk threshold for a single source is supported by EPA's guidance for conducting air toxics analyses and making risk management decisions at the facility and community-scale level. It is also the level set by the Project Risk Requirement in the Air District's Regulation 2, Rule 5 new and modified stationary sources of TAC, which states that the Air Pollution Control Officer shall deny an Authority to Construct or Permit to Operate for any new or modified source of TACs if the project risk exceeds a cancer risk of 10.0 in one million.

This threshold for an individual new source is designed to ensure that the source does not contribute a cumulatively significant impact. The justification for the Board Option 1 threshold of 5.0 in one million for new sources in an impacted community is that in these areas the cancer risk burden is higher than in other parts of the Bay Area; the threshold at which an individual source becomes significant is lower for an area that is already at or near unhealthy levels. However, even without a tiered approach, the recommended thresholds already address the burden of impacted communities via the cumulative thresholds: specifically, if an area has many existing TAC sources near receptors, then the cumulative threshold will be reached sooner than it would in another area with fewer TAC sources.

The single-source threshold for receptors is provided to address the possibility that within the area defined by the 1,000 foot radius there can be variations in risk levels that may be significant, below the corresponding cumulative threshold. Single-source thresholds assist in the identification of significant risks, hazards, or concentrations in a subarea, within the 1,000 foot radius.

***Increased Non-Cancer Risk to MEI***

Emissions from a new source or emissions affecting a new receptor would be considered significant where ground-level concentrations of non-carcinogenic TACs result in an increased chronic or acute Hazard Index (HI) from any source greater than 1.0. This threshold is unchanged under Board Option 1.

A HI less than 1.0 represents a TAC concentration, as determined by OEHHA that is at a health protective level. While some TACs pose non-carcinogenic, chronic and acute health hazards, if the TAC concentrations result in a HI less than one, those concentrations have been determined to be less than significant.

***Increased Ambient Concentration of PM<sub>2.5</sub>***

Emissions from a new source or emissions affecting a new receptor would be considered significant where ground-level concentrations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> from any source would result in an average annual increase greater than 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Under Board Option 1, within Impacted Communities as defined through the CARE program, the significance level for a PM<sub>2.5</sub> increment is 0.2 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.

If one applies the concentration-response function from the ARB consensus review (ARB 2008) and attribute a 10 percent increase in mortality to a 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup> increase in PM<sub>2.5</sub>, one finds an increase in non-injury mortality in the Bay Area of about 20 excess deaths per year from a 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> increment of PM<sub>2.5</sub>. This is consistent with the impacts reported and considered significant by SFDPH (2008) using an earlier study (Jerrett et al. 2005) to estimate the increase in mortality from a 0.2 µg/m<sup>3</sup> PM<sub>2.5</sub> increment.

The SFDPH recommended a lower threshold of significance for multiple sources but only considered roadway emissions within a 492 foot radius. This recommendation applies to a single source but considers all types of emissions within 1,000 feet. On balance, the Air District estimates that the SFDPH threshold and this proposed one, in combination with the cumulative threshold for PM<sub>2.5</sub>, will afford similar levels of health protection.

The proposed PM<sub>2.5</sub> threshold represents the lower range of an EPA proposed Significant Impact Level (SIL). EPA interprets the SIL to be the level of ambient impact that is considered to represent a “significant contribution” to regional non-attainment. While this threshold was not designed to be a threshold for assessing community risk and hazards, it was designed to protect public health at a regional level by helping an area maintain the NAAQS. Since achieving and maintaining state and federal AAQS is a reasonable goal at the local scale, the SIL provides a useful reference for comparison.

This threshold for an individual new source is designed to ensure that the source does not contribute a cumulatively significant impact. The justification for the Board Option 1 threshold of 0.2 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for new sources in an impacted community is that these areas have higher levels of diesel particulate matter than do other parts of the Bay Area; the threshold at which an individual source becomes significant is lower for an area that is already at or near unhealthy levels. However, even without a tiered approach, the recommended thresholds already address the burden of impacted communities via the

cumulative thresholds: specifically, if an area has many existing PM<sub>2.5</sub> sources near receptors, then the cumulative threshold will be reached sooner than it would in another area with fewer PM<sub>2.5</sub> sources.

The single-source threshold for receptors is provided to address the possibility that within the area defined by the 1,000 foot radius there can be variations in risk levels that may be significant, below the corresponding cumulative threshold. Single-source thresholds assist in the identification of significant risks, hazards, or concentrations in a subarea, within the 1,000 foot radius.

### **3.3.2.1 ACCIDENTAL RELEASE OF ACUTELY HAZARDOUS AIR EMISSIONS**

The BAAQMD currently recommends, at a minimum, that the lead agency, in consultation with the administering agency of the Risk Management Prevention Program (RMPP), find that any project resulting in receptors being within the Emergency Response Planning Guidelines (ERPG) exposure level 2 for a facility has a significant air quality impact. ERPG exposure level 2 is defined as "the maximum airborne concentration below which it is believed that nearly all individuals could be exposed for up to one hour without experiencing or developing irreversible or other serious health effects or symptoms which could impair an individual's ability to take protective action."

Staff proposes continuing with the current threshold for the accidental release of hazardous air pollutants. Staff recommends that agencies consult with the California Emergency Management Agency for the most recent guidelines and regulations for the storage of hazardous materials. Staff proposes that projects using or storing acutely hazardous materials locating near existing receptors, and projects resulting in receptors locating near facilities using or storing acutely hazardous materials be considered significant.

The current Accidental Release/Hazardous Air Emissions threshold of significance could affect all projects, regardless of size, and require mitigation for Accidental Release/Hazardous Air Emissions impacts.

### **3.3.3 CUMULATIVE RISK AND HAZARD THRESHOLDS**

#### ***Qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan***

Proposed projects would be considered to be less than significant if they are consistent with a qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan (CRRP) adopted by the local jurisdiction with enforceable measures to reduce the community risk. Board Option 2 does not include the CCRP as a significance threshold.

Project proposed in areas where a CRRP has been adopted that are not consistent with the CRRP would be considered to have a significant impact.

Projects proposed in areas where a CRRP has not been adopted and that have the potential to expose sensitive receptors or the general public to emissions-related risk in

excess of the following thresholds from the aggregate of cumulative sources would be considered to have a significant air quality impact.

The conclusion that land use projects that comply with qualified Community Risk Reduction Plans are less than significant is supported by CEQA Guidelines Sections 15030(a)(3) and 15064(h)(3), which provides that a project's contribution to a cumulative problem can be less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact.

***Increased Cancer Risk to Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI)***

Emissions from a new source or emissions affecting a new receptor would be considered significant where ground-level concentrations of carcinogenic TACs from any source result in an increased cancer risk greater than 100.0 in one million.

The significance threshold of 100 in a million increased excess cancer risk would be applied to the cumulative emissions. The 100 in a million threshold is based on EPA guidance for conducting air toxics analyses and making risk management decisions at the facility and community-scale level. In protecting public health with an ample margin of safety, EPA strives to provide maximum feasible protection against risks to health from hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) by limiting risk to a level no higher than the one in ten thousand (100 in a million) estimated risk that a person living near a source would be exposed to at the maximum pollutant concentrations for 70 years (NESHAP 54 Federal Register 38044, September 14, 1989; CAA section 112(f)). One hundred in a million excess cancer cases is also consistent with the ambient cancer risk in the most pristine portions of the Bay Area based on the District's recent regional modeling analysis.

***Increased Non-Cancer Risk to MEI***

Emissions from a new source or emissions affecting a new receptor would be considered significant where ground-level concentrations of non-carcinogenic TACs result in an increased chronic or acute Hazard Index from any source greater than 1.0.

OEHHA has defined acceptable concentration levels for compounds that pose non-cancer health hazards. If the HI for a compound is less than one, non-cancer chronic and acute health impacts have been determined to be less than significant.

***Increased Ambient Concentration of PM<sub>2.5</sub>***

Emissions from a new source or emissions affecting a new receptor would be considered significant where ground-level concentrations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> from any source would result in an average annual increase greater than 0.8 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.

If one applies the concentration-response function from the ARB consensus review (ARB 2008) and attributes a 10 percent increase in mortality to a 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup> increase in PM<sub>2.5</sub>, one finds an increase in non-injury mortality in the Bay Area of about 50 excess deaths per year from a 0.8 µg/m<sup>3</sup> increment of PM<sub>2.5</sub>. This is greater the impacts reported and considered significant by SFDPH (2008) using an earlier study (Jerrett et al. 2005) to

estimate the increase in mortality from a  $0.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$   $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  increment (SFDPH reported 21 excess deaths per year). However, SFDPH only considered roadway emissions within a 492 foot radius. This proposed threshold applies to all types of emissions within 1,000 feet. In modeling applications for proposed projects, a larger radius results in a greater number of sources considered and higher modeled concentrations. On balance, the Air District estimates that the SFDPH threshold and this proposed one, in combination with the individual source threshold for  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ , will afford similar levels of health protection.

The proposed cumulative  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  threshold represents the middle range of an EPA proposed Significant Impact Level (SIL). EPA interprets the SIL to be the level of ambient impact that is considered to represent a “significant contribution” to regional non-attainment. While this threshold was not designed to be a threshold for assessing community risk and hazards, it was designed to protect public health at a regional level by helping an area maintain the NAAQS. Since achieving and maintaining state and federal AAQS is a reasonable goal at the local scale, the SIL provides a useful reference for comparison. Furthermore, the  $0.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  threshold is consistent with studies (Kleinman et al 2007) that examined the potential health impacts of roadway particles.

### **3.3.4 PLAN-LEVEL RISK AND HAZARD THRESHOLDS**

Staff proposes plan-level thresholds that will encourage a programmatic approach to addressing the overall adverse conditions resulting from risks and hazards that many Bay Area communities experience. By designating overlay zones in land use plans, local land use jurisdictions can take preemptive action before project-level review to reduce the potential for significant exposures to risk and hazard emissions. While this will require more up-front work at the general plan level, in the long-run this approach is a more feasible approach consistent with Air District and CARB guidance about siting sources and sensitive receptors that is more effective than project by project consideration of effects that often has more limited mitigation opportunities. This approach would also promote more robust cumulative consideration of effects of both existing and future development for the plan-level CEQA analysis as well as subsequent project-level analysis.

For local plans to have a less-than-significant impact with respect to potential risks and hazards, overlay zones would have to be established around existing and proposed land uses that would emit these air pollutants. Overlay zones to avoid risk impacts should be reflected in local plan policies, land use map(s), and implementing ordinances (e.g., zoning ordinance). The overlay zones around existing and future risk sources would be delineated using the quantitative approaches described above for project-level review and the resultant risk buffers would be included in the General Plan (or the EIR for the General Plan) to assist in site planning. BAAQMD will provide guidance as to the methods used to establish the TAC buffers and what standards to be applied for acceptable exposure level in the updated CEQA Guidelines document. Special overlay zones of at least 500 feet (or an appropriate distance determined by modeling and approved by the Air District) on each side of all freeways and high volume roadways would be included in this proposed threshold.

The threshold of significance for plan impacts could affect all plan adoptions and amendments and require mitigation for a plan's air quality impacts. Where sensitive receptors would be exposed above the acceptable exposure level, the plan impacts would be considered significant and mitigation would be required to be imposed either at the plan level (through policy) or at the project level (through project level requirements).

### **3.3.5 COMMUNITY RISK REDUCTION PLANS**

The goal of a Community Risk Reduction Plan would be to bring TAC and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations for the entire community covered by the Plan down to acceptable levels as identified by the local jurisdiction and approved by the Air District. This approach provides local agencies a proactive alternative to addressing communities with high levels of risk on a project-by-project approach. This approach is supported by CEQA Guidelines Section 15030(a)(3), which provides that a project's contribution to a cumulative problem can be less than cumulatively considerable "if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact." This approach is also further supported by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), which provides that a project's contribution to a cumulative effect is not considerable "if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program which provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem."

#### ***Qualified Community Risk Reduction Plans***

A qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan adopted by a local jurisdiction should:

- ▶ Include a defined CRRP planning area.
- ▶ Include base year and future year emissions inventories of TACs and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.
- ▶ Establish risk and exposure reduction targets for the community.
- ▶ Identify measures to reduce emissions and exposures.
- ▶ Include Air District–approved risk modeling.
- ▶ Include procedures for monitoring and updating the TAC inventory, modeling and reduction measures, in coordination with Air District staff.
- ▶ Include public participation processes to facilitate community input into goals and strategies.

## 4 CRITERIA POLLUTANT THRESHOLDS

### 4.2 PROPOSED THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<b>Project Construction</b>	
<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Average Daily (pounds/day)</b>
ROG (reactive organic gases)	54
NO <sub>x</sub> (nitrogen oxides)	54
PM <sub>10</sub> (exhaust) (particulate matter-10 microns)	82
PM <sub>2.5</sub> (exhaust) (particulate matter-2.5 microns)	54
PM <sub>10</sub> /PM <sub>2.5</sub> (fugitive dust)	Best Management Practices
Local CO (carbon monoxide)	None

<b>Project Operations</b>		
<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Average Daily (pounds/day)</b>	<b>Maximum Annual (tons/year)</b>
ROG	54	10
NO <sub>x</sub>	54	10
PM <sub>10</sub>	82	15
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	54	10
Local CO	9.0 ppm (8-hour average), 20.0 ppm (1-hour average)	

<b>Plans</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consistency with Current Air Quality Plan control measures</li> <li>2. Projected VMT or vehicle trip increase is less than or equal to projected population increase</li> </ol>

### 4.3 JUSTIFICATION AND SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THRESHOLDS

#### 4.3.1 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION CRITERIA POLLUTANT THRESHOLDS

Staff proposes criteria pollutant construction thresholds that add significance criteria for exhaust emissions to the existing fugitive dust criteria employed by the Air District. While our current Guidelines considered construction exhaust emissions controlled by the overall air quality plan, the implementation of new and more stringent state and federal standards over the past ten years now warrants additional control of this source of emissions.

The average daily criteria air pollutant and precursor emission levels shown above are recommended as the thresholds of significance for construction activity for exhaust emissions. These thresholds represent the levels above which a project's individual

emissions would result in a considerable contribution (i.e., significant) to the SFBAAB's existing non-attainment air quality conditions and thus establish a nexus to regional air quality impacts that satisfies CEQA requirements for evidence-based determinations of significant impacts.

For fugitive dust emissions, staff recommends following the current best management practices approach which has been a pragmatic and effective approach to the control of fugitive dust emissions. Studies have demonstrated (Western Regional Air Partnership, U.S.EPA) that the application of best management practices at construction sites have significantly controlled fugitive dust emissions. Individual measures have been shown to reduce fugitive dust by anywhere from 30 percent to more than 90 percent. In the aggregate best management practices will substantially reduce fugitive dust emissions from construction sites. These studies support staff's recommendation that projects implementing construction best management practices will reduce fugitive dust emissions to a less than significant level.

#### **4.3.2 PROJECT OPERATION CRITERIA POLLUTANT THRESHOLDS**

The proposed thresholds for project operations are the average daily and maximum annual criteria air pollutant and precursor levels shown above. These thresholds are based on the federal BAAQMD Offset Requirements to ozone precursors for which the SFBAAB is designated as a non-attainment area which is an appropriate approach to prevent further deterioration of ambient air quality and thus has nexus and proportionality to prevention of a regionally cumulative significant impact (e.g. worsened status of non-attainment). Despite non-attainment area for state PM<sub>10</sub> and pending nonattainment for federal PM<sub>2.5</sub>, the federal NSR Significant Emission Rate annual limits of 15 and 10 tons per year, respectively, are proposed thresholds as BAAQMD has not established an Offset Requirement limit for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and the existing limit of 100 tons per year is much less stringent and would not be appropriate in light of our pending nonattainment designation for the federal 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard. These thresholds represent the emission levels above which a project's individual emissions would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the SFBAAB's existing air quality conditions. The thresholds would be an evaluation of the incremental contribution of a project to a significant cumulative impact. These threshold levels are well-established in terms of existing regulations as promoting review of emissions sources to prevent cumulative deterioration of air quality. Using existing environmental standards in this way to establish CEQA thresholds of significance under Guidelines section 15067.4 is an appropriate and effective means of promoting consistency in significance determinations and integrating CEQA environmental review activities with other areas of environmental regulation. (*See Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 98, 111.<sup>4</sup>)

---

<sup>4</sup> The Court of Appeal in the *Communities for a Better Environment* case held that existing regulatory standards could not be used as a definitive determination of whether a project would be significant under CEQA where there is substantial evidence to the contrary. Staff's proposed thresholds would not do that. The thresholds are levels at which a project's emissions would normally be significant, but would not be binding on a lead agency if there is contrary evidence in the record.

### **4.3.3 LOCAL CARBON MONOXIDE THRESHOLDS**

The proposed carbon monoxide thresholds are based solely on ambient concentration limits set by the California Clean Air Act for Carbon Monoxide and Appendix G of the State of California CEQA Guidelines.

Since the ambient air quality standards are health-based (i.e., protective of public health), there is substantial evidence (i.e., health studies that the standards are based on) in support of their use as CEQA significance thresholds. The use of the ambient standard would relate directly to the CEQA checklist question. By not using a proxy standard, there would be a definitive bright line about what is or is not a significant impact and that line would be set using a health-based level.

The CAAQS of 20.0 ppm and 9 ppm for 1-hour and 8-hour CO, respectively, would be used as the thresholds of significance for localized concentrations of CO. Carbon monoxide is a directly emitted pollutant with primarily localized adverse effects when concentrations exceed the health based standards established by the California Air Resources Board (ARB).

In addition, Appendix G of the State of California CEQA Guidelines includes the checklist question: Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? Answering yes to this question would indicate that the project would result in a significant impact under CEQA. The use of the ambient standard would relate directly to this checklist question.

### **4.3.4 PLAN-LEVEL CRITERIA POLLUTANT THRESHOLDS**

This proposed threshold achieves the same goals as the Air District's current approach while alleviating the existing analytical difficulties and the inconsistency of comparing a plan update with AQP growth projections that may be up to several years old. Eliminating the analytical inconsistency provides better nexus and proportionality for evaluating air quality impacts for plans.

Over the years staff has received comments on the difficulties inherent in the current approach regarding the consistency tests for population and VMT growth. First, the population growth estimates used in the most recent AQP can be up to several years older than growth estimates used in a recent plan update, creating an inconsistency in this analysis. Staff recommends that this test of consistency be eliminated because the Air District and local jurisdictions all use regional population growth estimates that are disaggregated to local cities and counties. In addition, the impact to air quality is not necessarily growth but where that growth is located. The second test, rate of increase in vehicle use compared to growth rate, will determine if planned growth will impact air quality. Compact infill development inherently has less vehicle travel and more transit opportunities than suburban sprawl.

Second, the consistency test of comparing the rate of increase in VMT to the rate of increase in population has been problematic at times for practitioners because VMT is not always available with the project analysis. Staff recommends that either the rate of increase in VMT or vehicle trips be compared to the rate of increase in population. Staff also recommends that the growth estimates used in this analysis be for the years covered by the plan. Staff also recommends that the growth estimates be obtained from the Association of Bay Area Governments since the Air District uses ABAG growth estimates for air quality planning purposes.

## 5 ODOR THRESHOLDS

### 5.2 PROPOSED THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Project Operations – Source or Receptor	Plans
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More than one confirmed complaint per year averaged over a three year period; or</li> <li>2. More than three unconfirmed complaints per year averaged over a three year period</li> </ol>	<p>Identify (Overlay Zones) and include policies to reduce the impacts of existing or planned sources of odors</p>

### 5.3 JUSTIFICATION AND SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THRESHOLDS

Staff proposes continuing the current CEQA significance threshold for odors (based on complaint history). The current approach has proven adaptable to different projects and locations and thus continuation of the current approach with more qualitative guidance is considered an appropriate approach to CEQA evaluation.

Odors are generally considered a nuisance, but can result in a public health concern. Some land uses that are needed to provide services to the population of an area can result in offensive odors, such as filling portable propane tanks or recycling center operations. When a proposed project includes the siting of sensitive receptors in proximity to an existing odor source, or when siting a new source of potential odors, the following qualitative evaluation should be performed.

When determining whether potential for odor impacts exists, it is recommended that Lead Agencies consider the following factors and make a determination based on evidence in each qualitative analysis category:

- ▶ **Distance:** Use the screening-level distances in Table 9.

- ▶ **Wind Direction:** Consider whether sensitive receptors are located upwind or downwind from the source for the most of the year. If odor occurrences associated with the source are seasonal in nature, consider whether sensitive receptors are located downwind during the season in which odor emissions occur.
  
- ▶ **Complaint History:** Consider whether there is a history of complaints associated with the source. If there is no complaint history associated with a particular source (perhaps because sensitive receptors do not already exist in proximity to the source), consider complaint-history associated with other similar sources in BAAQMD’s jurisdiction with potential to emit the same or similar types of odorous chemicals or compounds, or that accommodate similar types of processes.
  
- ▶ **Character of Source:** Consider the character of the odor source, for example, the type of odor events according to duration of exposure or averaging time (e.g., continuous release, frequent release events, or infrequent events).
  
- ▶ **Exposure:** Consider whether the project would result in the exposure of a substantial number of people to odorous emissions.

<b>Table 9 – Screening Distances for Potential Odor Sources</b>	
<b>Type of Operation Project Screening</b>	<b>Distance</b>
Wastewater Treatment Plant	2 miles
Wastewater Pumping Facilities	1 mile
Sanitary Landfill	2 miles
Transfer Station	1 mile
Composting Facility	1 mile
Petroleum Refinery	2 miles
Asphalt Batch Plant	2 miles
Chemical Manufacturing	2 miles
Fiberglass Manufacturing	1 mile
Painting/Coating Operations	1 mile
Rendering Plant	2 miles
Food Processing Facility	1 mile
Confined Animal Facility/Feed Lot/Dairy	1 mile
Green Waste and Recycling Operations	1 mile
Coffee Roaster	1 mile

California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). Facilities that are regulated by the CIWMB (e.g. landfill, composting, etc.) are required to have Odor Impact Minimization Plans (OIMP) in place and have procedures that establish fence line odor detection thresholds. The Air District recognizes a Lead Agency’s discretion under CEQA to use established odor detection thresholds as thresholds of significance for CEQA review for CIWMB regulated facilities with an adopted OIMP.

## REFERENCES

- ARB. *See* California Air Resources Board.
- BAAQMD. *See* Bay Area Air Quality Management District.
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 1999 (December). *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*. San Francisco, CA.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. Regulation 2, Rule 2. New Source Review. Available: <<http://www.baaqmd.gov/dst/regulations/rg0202.pdf>>. Accessed February 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. CARE Phase 1 Findings and Policy Recommendations. Available: <[http://baaqmd.gov/CARE/documents/care\\_p1\\_findings\\_recommendations\\_v2.pdf](http://baaqmd.gov/CARE/documents/care_p1_findings_recommendations_v2.pdf)>. Accessed March 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. Source Inventory of Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Emissions. San Francisco, CA.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. *Revised Draft Options and Justifications Report – California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance* (<http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/Revised%20Draft%20CEQA%20Thresholds%20%20Justification%20Report%20Oct%202009.ashx>)
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. 2008 (January). *CEQA and Climate Change*. Sacramento, CA. Available: <<http://www.capcoa.org/CEQA/CAPCOA%20White%20Paper.pdf>>. Accessed April 10, 2009.
- California Air Resources Board. 2000. Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles. Stationary Source Division. Mobile Source Control Division. October.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. Staff Report: Public Hearing to Consider Amendments to the Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter and Sulfates. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/std-rs/pm-final/pm-final.htm>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. *Land Use Compatibility Handbook. A Community Health Perspective*. Sacramento, CA.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008a. *Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan*. Sacramento, CA. Adopted in December 2008 Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm>>. Accessed March 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008b. *Methodology for Estimating Premature Deaths Associated with Long-term Exposure to Fine Airborne Particulate Matter in California*. Staff

- Report. Sacramento, CA. October 24. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-mort.htm#NEW>>. Accessed November 2009.
- Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan*. Sacramento, CA. Adopted in December 2008 Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm>>. Accessed March 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009a. Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Forecast. Available: <[http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/tables/arb\\_ghg\\_inventory\\_forecast\\_2008\\_06\\_26.xls](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/tables/arb_ghg_inventory_forecast_2008_06_26.xls)>. Accessed March 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009b. *Preliminary Draft Staff Proposal: Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Significance Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases under the California Environmental Quality Act*. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/localgov/ceqa/meetings/10270prelimdraftproposal102408.pdf>>. Accessed March 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009c. *Area Designations and Maps*. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/desig.htm>>, Accessed April 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009d. Proposed Regulation to Implement the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, Staff Report Initial Statement Reasons. March 5. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/fuels/lcfs/lcfs.htm>>. Accessed, August 20, 2009.
- CEC. See California Energy Commission.
- CEC. 2007. Impact Analysis 2008 Update to the California Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings. Available: <[http://www.energy.ca.gov/title22008standards/rulemaking/documents/2007-11-07\\_IMPACT\\_ANALYSIS.PDF](http://www.energy.ca.gov/title22008standards/rulemaking/documents/2007-11-07_IMPACT_ANALYSIS.PDF)>. Accessed March 2009.
- California Department of Finance. 2009. Residential Development Data: E5 – City and County Population Estimates. 2000-2050 - Race and Ethnic Populations Totals. Available: <<http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/?pageid=145>>. Accessed February 2009.
- California Economic Development Department. 2009. Commercial/Industrial Employment Data: Projections of Employment by Industry and Occupation. Available: <<http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/?pageid=145>>. Accessed February 2009.
- City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Health. 2008. Assessment and Mitigation of Air Pollutant Health Effects from Intra-urban Roadways: Guidance for Land Use Planning and Environmental Review. Program on Health, Equity, & Sustainability. Occupational & Environmental Health Section. Prepared by Rajiv Bhatia and Thomas Rivard. May 6.

- Dockery D. 1993. An association between air pollution and mortality in six U.S. cities. *N Engl J Med* 329:1753–1759.
- EPA. *See* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- Governor's Office of Planning and Research. 2008 (June 19). *Technical Advisory: CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*. Sacramento, CA. Available: <<http://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf>>. Accessed February 2009.
- Hiltermann T, Bruijne Cd, Stolk J, Zwinderman A, Spijksma F, Roemer W, et al. 1997. Effects of photochemical air pollution and allergen exposure on upper respiratory tract inflammation in asthmatics. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 156(6):1765–1772.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007a (February). *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC*. Geneva, Switzerland.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007a (February). *Climate Change 2007: Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report Summary for Policymakers*. Geneva, Switzerland.
- IPCC. *See* Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- Jerrett M et al. 2005. Spatial Analysis of Air Pollution and Mortality in Los Angeles. *Epidemiology*. 16: 727-736
- Kleinman, M.T., Sioutas, C., Froines, J.R., Fanning, E., Hamade, A., Mendez, L., Meacher, D., Oldham, M. Inhalation of Concentrated Ambient Particulate Matter Near a Heavily Trafficked Road Simulates Antigen-Induced Airway Responses in Mice; *Inhal. Toxicol.* 2007, 19 (Supp. 1), 117-126.
- Laden, F.; Schwartz, J.; Speizer, F.E.; Dockery, D.W. Reduction in Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Mortality: Extended Follow-Up of the Harvard Six Cities Study. *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* (2006), 173, 667-672.
- OPR. *See* Governor's Office of Planning and Research.
- Pope C III, Thun M, Namboordiri M, Dockery D, Evans J, Speizer F. 1995. Particulate air pollution as a predictor of mortality in a prospective study of U.S. adults. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 151(3):669–6
- Rimpo and Associates. 2009. BAAQMD CEQA Projects Database. Orangevale, CA.

- Schauer JJ, Lough GC, Schafer MM, Christensen WF, Arndt MF, DeMinter JT, et al. 2006. Characterization of metals emitted from motor vehicles. *Res Rep Health Eff Inst* 133:1-7.
- Schikowski T, Sugiri D, Ranft U, Gehring U, Heinrich J, Wichmann E, et al. 2005. Long-term air pollution exposure and living close to busy roads are associated with COPD in women. *Respir Res* 6(1):152.
- Schwartz, J.; Coull, B.; Laden, F.; Ryan, L. The Effect of Dose and Timing of Dose on the Association between Airborne Particles and Survival. *Env Health Persp* (2008) 116, 1: 64-69.
- SFDPH. See City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Health.
- UNFCCC. See United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. 2009. *Article 1 of the UNFCCC*. Available: [http://unfccc.int/essential\\_background/convention/background/items/2536.php](http://unfccc.int/essential_background/convention/background/items/2536.php). Accessed April 8, 2009.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2008. Federal Register: Implementation of the New Source Review (NSR) Program for Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) less than 2.5 Micrometers. Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-AIR/200May/Day-1a10768.pdf>>. Accessed February 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. Monitor Values Report Data. Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/air/data/index.html>>. Accessed April 8, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. C. Cowherd, et al., *Control of Open Fugitive Dust Sources*, EPA-450/3-88-008, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, September 1988.
- Van Hee, V.C., Adar, S.D., Szpiro, A.A., Barr, R.G., Bluemke, D.A., Diez Roux, A.V., Gill, E.A., Sheppard, L., Kaufman, J.D. Exposure to Traffic and Left Ventricular Mass and Function; *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* 2009, 179 (9), 827-834.
- Vineis P, Hoek G, Krzyzanowski M, Vigna-Taglianti F, Veglia F, Airoidi L, et al. 2007. Lung cancers attributable to environmental tobacco smoke and air pollution in non-smokers in different European countries: a prospective study. *Environ Health* 6:7; doi:10.1186/1476-069X-6-7 [Online 15 February 2007]
- Western Regional Air Partnership. 2006. *WRAP Fugitive Dust Handbook*. September 7, 2006. Available: [http://www.wrapair.org/forums/dejf/fdh/content/FDHandbook\\_Rev\\_06.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/forums/dejf/fdh/content/FDHandbook_Rev_06.pdf). Accessed September 2009.

Bay Area AQMD Proposed Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance  
December 7, 2009

Zhu, Y. Hinds, W.C., Kim S, and Sioutas, C. 2002. Concentration and size distribution of ultrafine particles near a major highway. *Journal of Air and Waste Management Association*. 2002 Sep; 52 (9): 1032-42.