

DATE: July 3, 2023
TO: Mandi Needle, CASC Planning and Engineering
FROM: Haseeb Qureshi
Ali Dadabhoy
JOB NO: 15092-03 AQ & GHG Assessment

CALIFORNIA STREET & REDLANDS BLVD. AIR QUALITY & GREENHOUSE GAS

Mandi Needle,


Urban Crossroads, Inc. is pleased to provide the following Air Quality (AQ) & Greenhouse Gas (GHG) for the California Street & Redlands Blvd. (**Project**), which is located at the intersection of California Street and Redlands Blvd. in the City of Redland.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Project is proposed to reconstruct the northwest corner of the California Street and Redlands Boulevard intersection and widen the west side of California Street. The Project's site plan is illustrated on Exhibit 1.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Results of the assessment indicate that the Project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to air quality and greenhouse gas and no mitigation is required.

EXHIBIT 1: PROJECT'S SITE PLAN**PROJECT AIR QUALITY IMPACTS****AIR QUALITY SETTING****SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN (SCAB)**

The Project site is located in the SCAB within the jurisdiction of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) (3). The SCAQMD was created by the 1977 Lewis-Presley Air Quality Management Act, which merged four county air pollution control bodies into one regional district. Under the Act, the SCAQMD is responsible for bringing air quality in areas under its jurisdiction into conformity with federal and state air quality standards. As previously stated, the Project site is located within the SCAB, a 6,745-square mile subregion of the SCAQMD, which includes portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, and all of Orange County.

The SCAB is bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. The Los Angeles County portion of the Mojave Desert Air Basin is bounded by the San Gabriel Mountains to the south and west, the Los Angeles / Kern County border to the north, and the Los Angeles / San Bernardino County border to the east. The Riverside County portion of the Salton Sea Air Basin is bounded by the San Jacinto Mountains in the west and spans eastward up to the Palo Verde Valley.

Regional Climate

The regional climate has a substantial influence on air quality in the SCAB. In addition, the temperature, wind, humidity, precipitation, and amount of sunshine influence the air quality.

The annual average temperatures throughout the SCAB vary from the low to middle 60s degrees Fahrenheit (°F). Due to a decreased marine influence, the eastern portion of the SCAB shows greater variability in average annual minimum and maximum temperatures. January is the coldest month throughout the SCAB, with average minimum temperatures of 47°F in downtown Los Angeles and 36°F in San Bernardino. All portions of the SCAB have recorded maximum temperatures above 100°F.

Although the climate of the SCAB can be characterized as semi-arid, the air near the land surface is quite moist on most days because of the presence of a marine layer. This shallow layer of sea air is an important modifier of SCAB climate. Humidity restricts visibility in the SCAB, and the conversion of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) to sulfates (SO₄) is heightened in air with high relative humidity. The marine layer provides an environment for that conversion process, especially during the spring and summer months. The annual average relative humidity within the SCAB is 71 percent (%) along the coast and 59% inland. Since the ocean effect is dominant, periods of heavy early morning fog are frequent and low stratus clouds are a characteristic feature. These effects decrease with distance from the coast.

More than 90% of the SCAB's rainfall occurs from November through April. The annual average rainfall varies from approximately nine inches in Riverside to fourteen inches in downtown Los Angeles. Monthly and yearly rainfall totals are extremely variable. Summer rainfall usually consists of widely scattered thunderstorms near the coast and slightly heavier shower activity in the eastern portion of the SCAB with frequency being higher near the coast.

Due to its generally clear weather, about three-quarters of available sunshine is received in the SCAB. The remaining one-quarter is absorbed by clouds. The ultraviolet portion of this abundant radiation is a key factor in photochemical reactions. On the shortest day of the year there are approximately 10 hours of possible sunshine, and on the longest day of the year there are approximately 14½ hours of possible sunshine.

The importance of wind to air pollution is considerable. The direction and speed of the wind determines the horizontal dispersion and transport of the air pollutants. During the late autumn to early spring rainy season, the SCAB is subjected to wind flows associated with the traveling storms moving through the region from the northwest. This period also brings five to ten periods of strong, dry offshore winds, locally termed "Santa Anas" each year. During the dry season, which coincides with the months of maximum photochemical smog concentrations, the wind flow is bimodal, typified by a daytime onshore sea breeze and a nighttime offshore drainage wind. Summer wind flows are created by the pressure differences between the relatively cold ocean

and the unevenly heated and cooled land surfaces that modify the general northwesterly wind circulation over southern California. Nighttime drainage begins with the radiational cooling of the mountain slopes. Heavy, cool air descends the slopes and flows through the mountain passes and canyons as it follows the lowering terrain toward the ocean. Another characteristic wind regime in the SCAB is the “Catalina Eddy,” a low level cyclonic (counterclockwise) flow centered over Santa Catalina Island which results in an offshore flow to the southwest. On most spring and summer days, some indication of an eddy is apparent in coastal sections.

In the SCAB, there are two distinct temperature inversion structures that control vertical mixing of air pollution. During the summer, warm high-pressure descending (subsiding) air is undercut by a shallow layer of cool marine air. The boundary between these two layers of air is a persistent marine subsidence/inversion. This boundary prevents vertical mixing which effectively acts as an impervious lid to pollutants over the entire SCAB. The mixing height for the inversion structure is normally situated 1,000 to 1,500 feet above mean sea level.

A second inversion-type forms in conjunction with the drainage of cool air off the surrounding mountains at night followed by the seaward drift of this pool of cool air. The top of this layer forms a sharp boundary with the warmer air aloft and creates nocturnal radiation inversions. These inversions occur primarily in the winter when nights are longer and onshore flow is weakest. They are typically only a few hundred feet above mean sea level. These inversions effectively trap pollutants, such as nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and carbon monoxide (CO) from vehicles, as the pool of cool air drifts seaward. Winter is therefore a period of high levels of primary pollutants along the coastline.

Wind Patterns and Project Location

The distinctive climate of the Project area and the SCAB is determined by its terrain and geographical location. The SCAB is located in a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills, bounded by the Pacific Ocean in the southwest quadrant with high mountains forming the remainder of the perimeter.

Wind patterns across the south coastal region are characterized by westerly and southwesterly onshore winds during the day and easterly or northeasterly breezes at night. Winds are characteristically light although the speed is somewhat greater during the dry summer months than during the rainy winter season.

Criteria Pollutants

Both the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) have established ambient air quality standards for common pollutants. These ambient air quality standards are levels of contaminants representing safe levels that avoid specific adverse health effects associated with each pollutant. The ambient air quality standards cover what are called “criteria” pollutants because the health and other effects of each pollutant are described in criteria documents. The six criteria pollutants are ozone (O₃) (precursor emissions include NO_x and reactive organic gases (ROG), CO, particulate matter (PM), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead. Areas that meet ambient air quality standards are classified as attainment areas, while areas that do not meet these standards are classified as nonattainment areas. The Riverside County portion of the SCAB is designated as a nonattainment area for the federal O₃

and PM_{2.5} standards and is also a nonattainment area for the state standards for O₃, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}.

Sensitive Receptor Locations

Some people are especially sensitive to air pollution and are given special consideration when evaluating air quality impacts from projects. These groups of people include children, the elderly, and individuals with pre-existing respiratory or cardiovascular illness. Structures that house these persons or places where they gather are defined as “sensitive receptors”. These structures typically include uses such as residences, hotels, and hospitals where an individual can remain for 24 hours. Consistent with the LST Methodology, the nearest land use where an individual could remain for 24 hours to the Project site has been used to determine construction and operational air quality impacts for emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, since PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} thresholds are based on a 24-hour averaging time.

Receptors in the Project study area are described below. All distances are measured from the Project site boundary to the outdoor living areas (e.g., backyards) or at the building façade, whichever is closer to the Project site. Receptors in the Project study area are shown on Exhibit 2 under the Localized Construction Emissions section later in the report.

- Receptor R1 represents the existing residences at 26448 Redlands Blvd, approximately 126 feet west of the Project site.
- Receptor R2 represents the existing residences at 2061 Redlands Blvd, approximately 210 feet southeast of the Project site.
- Receptor R3 represents the Mission Elementary School at 10568 California St, approximately 222 feet south of the Project site.
- Receptor R4 represents the ampm at 2098 W Redlands Blvd, approximately 109 feet east of the Project site.

REGULATORY BACKGROUND

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

The EPA is responsible for setting and enforcing the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for O₃, CO, NO_x, SO₂, PM₁₀, and lead (Pb) (5). The EPA has jurisdiction over emissions sources that are under the authority of the federal government including aircraft, locomotives, and emissions sources outside state waters (Outer Continental Shelf). The EPA also establishes emission standards for vehicles sold in states other than California. Automobiles sold in California must meet the stricter emission requirements of CARB.

The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) was first enacted in 1955 and has been amended numerous times in subsequent years (1963, 1965, 1967, 1970, 1977, and 1990). The CAA establishes the federal air quality standards, the NAAQS, and specifies future dates for achieving compliance (6). The CAA also mandates that each state submit and implement state implementation plans (SIPs) for local areas not meeting these standards. These plans must include pollution control measures that demonstrate how the standards will be met.

The 1990 amendments to the CAA that identify specific emission reduction goals for areas not meeting the NAAQS require a demonstration of reasonable further progress toward attainment and incorporate additional sanctions for failure to attain or to meet interim milestones. The sections of the CAA most directly applicable to the development of the Project site include Title I (Non-Attainment Provisions) and Title II (Mobile Source Provisions) (7) (8). Title I provisions were established with the goal of attaining the NAAQS for the following criteria pollutants O_3 , NO_2 , SO_2 , PM_{10} , CO , $PM_{2.5}$, and Pb . The NAAQS were amended in July 1997 to include an additional standard for O_3 and to adopt a NAAQS for $PM_{2.5}$.

Mobile source emissions are regulated in accordance with Title II provisions. These provisions require the use of cleaner burning gasoline and other cleaner burning fuels such as methanol and natural gas. Automobile manufacturers are also required to reduce tailpipe emissions of hydrocarbons and NO_x . NO_x is a collective term that includes all forms of NO_x which are emitted as byproducts of the combustion process.

CALIFORNIA REGULATIONS

CARB

The CARB, which became part of the California EPA (CalEPA) in 1991, is responsible for ensuring implementation of the California Clean Air Act (AB 2595), responding to the federal CAA, and for regulating emissions from consumer products and motor vehicles. AB 2595 mandates achievement of the maximum degree of emissions reductions possible from vehicular and other mobile sources in order to attain the state ambient air quality standards by the earliest practical date. The CARB established the California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) for all pollutants for which the federal government has NAAQS and, in addition, establishes standards for SO_4 , visibility, hydrogen sulfide (H_2S), and vinyl chloride (C_2H_3Cl). However, at this time, H_2S and C_2H_3Cl are not measured at any monitoring stations in the SCAB because they are not considered to be a regional air quality problem. Generally, the CAAQS are more stringent than the NAAQS (1) (2).

Local air quality management districts, such as the SCAQMD, regulate air emissions from stationary sources such as commercial and industrial facilities. All air pollution control districts have been formally designated as attainment or non-attainment for each CAAQS.

Serious non-attainment areas are required to prepare Air Quality Management Plans (AQMP) that include specified emission reduction strategies in an effort to meet clean air goals. These plans are required to include:

- Application of Best Available Retrofit Control Technology to existing sources;
- Developing control programs for area sources (e.g., architectural coatings and solvents) and indirect sources (e.g. motor vehicle use generated by residential and commercial development);
- A District permitting system designed to allow no net increase in emissions from any new or modified permitted sources of emissions;
- Implementing reasonably available transportation control measures and assuring a substantial reduction in growth rate of vehicle trips and miles traveled;
- Significant use of low emissions vehicles by fleet operators;

- Sufficient control strategies to achieve a 5% or more annual reduction in emissions or 15% or more in a period of three years for ROG_s, NO_x, CO and PM₁₀. However, air basins may use alternative emission reduction strategy that achieves a reduction of less than 5% per year under certain circumstances.

AQMP

Currently, the NAAQS and CAAQS are exceeded in most parts of the SCAB. In response, the SCAQMD has adopted a series of AQMP to meet the state and federal ambient air quality standards (10). AQMPs are updated regularly in order to more effectively reduce emissions, accommodate growth, and to minimize any negative fiscal impacts of air pollution control on the economy.

APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

SCAQMD Rules that are currently applicable during construction activity for this Project include but are not limited to Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings) (3) (4). Implementation of these rules are required pursuant to existing law and therefore is considered part of the Project.

SCAQMD Rule 403

This rule is intended to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of anthropogenic (human-made) fugitive dust sources by requiring actions to prevent and reduce fugitive dust emissions. Rule 403 applies to any activity or human-made condition capable of generating fugitive dust and requires best available control measures to be applied to earth moving and grading activities. This rule is intended to reduce PM₁₀ emissions from any transportation, handling, construction, or storage activity that has the potential to generate fugitive dust. PM₁₀ suppression techniques are summarized below.

- Portions of a construction site to remain inactive longer than a period of three months will be seeded and watered until grass cover is grown or otherwise stabilized.
- All onsite roads will be paved as soon as feasible or watered periodically or chemically stabilized.
- All material transported offsite will be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations will be minimized at all times.
- Where vehicles leave a construction site and enter adjacent public streets, the streets will be swept daily or washed down at the end of the workday to remove soil tracked onto the paved surface.

METHODOLOGY

In May 2022, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in conjunction with other California air districts, including SCAQMD, released the latest version of the CalEEMod Version 2022.1. The purpose of this model is to calculate construction-source and operational-source criteria pollutant (VOCs, NO_x, SO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}) and GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources; and quantify applicable air quality and GHG reductions achieved from

mitigation measures (5). Accordingly, the latest version of CalEEMod has been used for this Project to determine construction and operational air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Standards of Significance

The criteria used to determine the significance of potential Project-related air quality impacts are taken from the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines) (14 CCR §§15000, et seq.). Based on these thresholds, a project would result in a significant impact related to air quality if it would (6):

- **Threshold 1:** Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- **Threshold 2:** Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
- **Threshold 3:** Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- **Threshold 4:** Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

AIR QUALITY REGIONAL EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS

The SCAQMD has developed regional significance thresholds for criteria pollutants, as summarized at Table 1 (7). The SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Significance Thresholds (April 2019) indicate that any projects in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) with daily emissions that exceed any of the indicated thresholds should be considered as having an individually and cumulatively significant air quality impact.

TABLE 1: MAXIMUM DAILY REGIONAL EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS

Pollutant	Construction
NO _x	100 lbs/day
VOC	75 lbs/day
PM ₁₀	150 lbs/day
PM _{2.5}	55 lbs/day
SO _x	150 lbs/day
CO	550 lbs/day

lbs/day – Pounds Per Day

AIR QUALITY LOCALIZED EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS

For this Project, the appropriate Source Receptor Area (SRA) for the Localized Significant Thresholds (LST) analysis is the SCAQMD East San Bernardino Valley monitoring station (SRA 35). LSTs apply to CO, NO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. The SCAQMD produced look-up tables for projects less than or equal to 5 acres in size. The SCAQMD's screening look-up tables are utilized in determining localized impacts. It should be noted that since the look-up tables identify thresholds at only 1 acre, 2 acres, and 5 acres, linear regression has been utilized to determine localized

significance thresholds. Consistent with SCAQMD guidance, the thresholds presented in Table 2 were calculated by interpolating the threshold values for the Project's disturbed acreage.

TABLE 2: MAXIMUM DAILY LOCALIZED EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS

Source	Activity	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Construction	Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	102 lbs/day	699 lbs/day	5 lbs/day	4 lbs/day
	Linear, Grading & Excavation	247 lbs/day	2,012 lbs/day	24 lbs/day	9 lbs/day
	Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	154 lbs/day	1,134 lbs/day	11 lbs/day	5 lbs/day

¹Source of localized significance threshold (LSTs) is provided on page 14.

REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS SUMMARY

Construction activities associated with the Project would result in emissions of VOCs, NO_x, SO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Construction related emissions are expected from the following construction activities:

- Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing
- Linear, Grading & Excavation
- Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade
- Linear, Paving

ON-ROAD TRIPS

Construction generates on-road vehicle emissions from vehicle usage for workers and vendors commuting to and from the site. Vendor trips are based on CalEEMod defaults.

GRADING ACTIVITIES

Dust is typically a major concern during grading activities. Because such emissions are not amenable to collection and discharge through a controlled source, they are called "fugitive emissions". Fugitive dust emissions rates vary as a function of many parameters (soil silt, soil moisture, wind speed, area disturbed, number of vehicles, depth of disturbance or excavation, etc.). CalEEMod was utilized to calculate fugitive dust emissions resulting from this phase of activity. The Project would require 929 cubic yards of soil export. The CalEEMod default trip length of 20-miles will be used to analyze the emissions associated with import activities.

CONSTRUCTION DURATION

Per Project applicant provided data, construction of Project is expected to commence in April 2024 and would last through December 2024. The construction schedule utilized in the analysis, shown in Table 3, “worst-case” analysis scenario should construction occur any time after the respective dates since emission factors for construction decrease as time passes and the analysis year increases due to emission regulations becoming more stringent¹. The duration of construction activity and associated equipment represents a reasonable approximation of the expected construction fleet as required per CEQA Guidelines (8).

TABLE 3: CONSTRUCTION DURATION

Phase Name	Start Date	End Date	Days
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	4/3/2024	4/29/2024	19
Linear, Grading & Excavation	4/30/2024	8/28/2024	87
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	8/29/2024	11/16/2024	57
Linear, Paving	11/17/2024	12/27/2024	30

CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

Consistent with industry standards and typical construction practices, each piece of equipment listed in Table 4 will operate up to a total of eight (8) hours per day, or more than two-thirds of the period during which construction activities are allowed pursuant to the code.

TABLE 4: CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

Activity	Equipment	Amount	Hours Per Day
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	Crawler Tractors	1	8
	Excavators	2	8
	Signal Boards	1	8
	Crawler Tractors	1	8
	Excavators	3	8
	Graders	2	8
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Rollers	2	8
	Rubber Tired Loaders	1	8
	Scrapers	2	8
	Signal Boards	1	8
	Crawler Tractors	1	8

¹ As shown in the CalEEMod User's Guide Version 2022.1, Section 4.3 “Off-Road Equipment” as the analysis year increases, emission factors for the same equipment pieces decrease due to the natural turnover of older equipment being replaced by newer less polluting equipment and new regulatory requirements.

Activity	Equipment	Amount	Hours Per Day
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Air Compressors	1	8
	Generator Sets	1	8
	Graders	1	8
	Plate Compactors	1	8
	Pumps	1	8
	Rough Terrain Forklifts	1	8
	Scrapers	1	8
	Signal Boards	1	8
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8
	Pavers	1	8
Linear, Paving	Paving Equipment	1	8
	Rollers	2	8
	Signal Boards	1	8
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8

REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS SUMMARY

The estimated maximum daily construction emissions without mitigation are summarized on Table 5. Detailed construction model outputs are presented in Attachment A. Under the assumed scenarios, emissions resulting from the Project construction will not exceed thresholds established by the SCAQMD for emissions of any criteria pollutant and no mitigation is required.

TABLE 5 OVERALL REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS SUMMARY

Source	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Summer						
2024	4.26	37.39	41.38	0.07	3.24	1.82
Winter						
2024	2.18	19.47	22.16	0.04	1.58	0.87
Maximum Daily Emissions	4.26	37.39	41.38	0.07	3.24	1.82
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

¹PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} source emissions reflect 3x daily watering per SCAQMD Rule 403 for fugitive dust.

REGIONAL OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

Operational activities associated with Projects would result in emissions of CO, VOCs, NO_x, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Operational related emissions are from the following primary sources: area source emissions, energy source emissions, and mobile source emissions.

The proposed Project is to reconstruct the northwest corner of the California Street and Redlands Boulevard intersection and widen the west side of California Street. Because the Project does not generate any mobile trips and is intended to improve the LOS conditions of the Project road segment, there are no quantifiable operational emissions associated with the proposed Project and no further analysis is required.

SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

The analysis uses the methodology included in the SCAQMD *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* (LST Methodology) (9). The SCAQMD has established that impacts to air quality are significant if there is a potential to contribute or cause localized exceedances of the federal and/or state ambient air quality standards (NAAQS/CAAQS). Collectively, these are referred to as Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs). The SCAQMD established LSTs in response to the SCAQMD Governing Board's Environmental Justice Initiative I-42. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard at the sensitive receptor. The SCAQMD states that lead agencies can use the LSTs as another indicator of significance in its air quality impact analyses.

The SCAQMD recommends that the nearest sensitive receptor be considered when determining the Project's potential to cause an individual or cumulatively significant impact. The nearest land use where an individual could remain for 24 hours to the Project site has been used to determine localized construction impacts for emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} (since PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} thresholds are based on a 24-hour averaging time). The nearest receptor used for evaluation of localized impacts of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} is location R1 represented by the existing residence at 26448 Redlands Blvd, approximately 126 feet (38 meters) west of the Project site.

As previously stated, and consistent with LST Methodology, the nearest industrial/commercial use to the Project site is used to determine construction air impacts for emissions of NO_x and CO as the averaging periods for these pollutants are shorter (8 hours or less) and it is reasonable to assume that an individual could be present at these sites for periods of one to 8 hours. The nearest receptor used for evaluation of localized impacts of NO_x and CO is location R4 represented by the existing ampm at 2098 W Redlands Blvd, approximately 109 feet (33 meters) east of the Project site. Receptors in the Project study area shown on Exhibit 2.

2 The purpose of SCAQMD's Environmental Justice program is to ensure that everyone has the right to equal protection from air pollution and fair access to the decision-making process that works to improve the quality of air within their communities. Further, the SCAQMD defines Environmental Justice as "...equitable environmental policymaking and enforcement to protect the health of all residents, regardless of age, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, socioeconomic status, or geographic location, from the health effects of air pollution."

EXHIBIT 2: SENSITIVE RECEPTOR LOCATIONS



LOCALIZED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

Table 6 identifies the localized impacts at the nearest receptor location in the vicinity of the Project. Outputs from the model runs for construction LSTs are provided in Attachment A. For analytical purposes, emissions associated with peak site preparation and grading activities are considered for purposes of LSTs since these phases represents the maximum localized emissions that would occur. Any other construction phases of development that overlap would result in lesser emissions and consequently lesser impacts than what is disclosed herein. As shown in Table 6, emissions resulting from the construction will not exceed the numerical thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for any criteria pollutant. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur for localized Project-related construction-source emissions and no mitigation is required.

TABLE 6: PROJECT LOCALIZED CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing				
Maximum Daily Emissions	4.53	4.54	0.41	0.27
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	102	699	5	4
Threshold Exceeded?	NO	NO	NO	NO
Linear, Grading & Excavation				
Maximum Daily Emissions	37.04	37.91	2.68	1.68
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	247	2,012	24	9
Threshold Exceeded?	NO	NO	NO	NO
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade				
Maximum Daily Emissions	19.31	20.40	1.22	0.79
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	154	1,134	11	5
Threshold Exceeded?	NO	NO	NO	NO

LOCALIZED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

The Project proposes to reconstruct the northwest corner of the California Street and Redlands Boulevard intersection and widen the west side of California Street. According to SCAQMD LST methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a proposed project, if the project includes stationary sources, or attracts mobile sources that may spend long periods queuing and idling at the site (e.g., transfer facilities and warehouse buildings). The proposed project does not include such uses, and thus, due to the lack of significant stationary source emissions, no LST analysis is needed for operations.

AIR QUALITY IMPACTS – CONSISTENCY WITH THRESHOLD NO. 1

Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

The Project site is located within the SCAB, which is characterized by relatively poor air quality. The SCAQMD has jurisdiction over an approximately 10,743 square-mile area consisting of the four-county Basin and the Los Angeles County and Riverside County portions of what use to be referred to as the Southeast Desert Air Basin. In these areas, the SCAQMD is principally responsible for air pollution control, and works directly with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), county transportation commissions, local governments, as well as state and federal agencies to reduce emissions from stationary, mobile, and indirect sources to meet state and federal ambient air quality standards.

Currently, these state and federal air quality standards are exceeded in most parts of the SCAB. In response, the SCAQMD has adopted a series of AQMPs to meet the state and federal ambient air quality standards. AQMPs are updated regularly in order to more effectively reduce emissions, accommodate growth, and to minimize any negative fiscal impacts of air pollution control on the economy.

In December 2022, the SCAQMD released the *Final 2022 AQMP (2022 AQMP)*. The 2022 AQMP continues to evaluate current integrated strategies and control measures to meet the CAAQS, as well as explore new and innovative methods to reach its goals. Some of these approaches include utilizing incentive programs, recognizing existing co-benefit programs from other sectors, and developing a strategy with fair-share reductions at the federal, state, and local levels (10). Similar to the 2016 AQMP, the 2022 AQMP incorporates scientific and technological information and planning assumptions, including the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, a planning document that supports the integration of land use and transportation to help the region meet the federal CAA requirements (11). The Project's consistency with the AQMP will be determined using the 2022 AQMP as discussed below.

Criteria for determining consistency with the AQMP are defined in Chapter 12, Section 12.2 and Section 12.3 of the 1993 CEQA Handbook (12). These indicators are discussed below.

The proposed Project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP.

The violations under this criterion refer to the CAAQS and NAAQS. CAAQS and NAAQS violations would occur if regional or localized significance thresholds were exceeded.

CAAQS and NAAQS violations would occur if regional or localized significance thresholds were exceeded. As evaluated, the Project's regional and localized construction and operational-source emissions would not exceed applicable regional significance thresholds. As such, a less than significant impact is expected.

On the basis of the preceding discussion, the Project is determined to be consistent with the first criterion.

The Project will not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP based on the years of Project build-out phase.

The 2022 AQMP demonstrates that the applicable ambient air quality standards can be achieved within the timeframes required under federal law. Growth projections from local general plans adopted by cities in the district are provided to the SCAG, which develops regional growth forecasts, which are then used to develop future air quality forecasts for the AQMP. Development consistent with the growth projections in City of Redland General Plan is considered to be consistent with the AQMP.

Peak day emissions generated by construction activities are largely independent of land use assignments, but rather are a function of development scope and maximum area of disturbance. Irrespective of the site's land use designation, development of the site to its maximum potential would likely occur, with disturbance of the entire site occurring during construction activities. As such, when considering that no emissions thresholds will be exceeded, a less than significant impact would result.

The Project will not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP based on the years of Project build-out phase. Further, the Project will provide congestion relief and less delays in traffic flow due to implementation of the street widening.

On the basis of the preceding discussion, the Project is determined to be consistent with the second criterion.

AIR QUALITY IMPACTS – CONSISTENCY WITH THRESHOLD NO. 2

Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

The CAAQS designate the Project site as nonattainment for O₃, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} while the NAAQS designates the Project site as nonattainment for O₃ and PM_{2.5}.

The SCAQMD has published a report on how to address cumulative impacts from air pollution: White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution (13). In this report the SCAQMD clearly states (Page D-3):

“...the SCAQMD uses the same significance thresholds for project specific and cumulative impacts for all environmental topics analyzed in an Environmental Assessment or EIR. The only case where the significance thresholds for project specific and cumulative impacts differ is the Hazard Index (HI) significance threshold for TAC emissions. The project specific (project increment) significance threshold is HI > 1.0 while the cumulative (facility-wide) is HI > 3.0. It should be noted that the HI is only one of three TAC emission significance thresholds considered (when applicable) in a CEQA analysis. The other two are the maximum individual cancer risk (MICR) and the cancer burden, both of which use the same significance thresholds (MICR of 10 in 1 million and cancer burden of 0.5) for project specific and cumulative impacts.

Projects that exceed the project-specific significance thresholds are considered by the SCAQMD to be cumulatively considerable. This is the reason project-specific and cumulative significance thresholds are the same. Conversely, projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are generally not considered to be cumulatively significant.”

Therefore, this analysis assumes that individual projects that do not generate operational or construction emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which SCAB is in nonattainment, and, therefore, would not be considered to have a significant, adverse air quality impact. Alternatively, individual project-related construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds for project-specific impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable.

Construction Impacts

The Project-specific evaluation of emissions presented in the preceding analysis demonstrates that proposed Project construction-source air pollutant emissions would not result in exceedances of regional thresholds. Therefore, the proposed Project construction-source emissions would be considered less than significant on a project-specific and cumulative basis.

AIR QUALITY IMPACTS – CONSISTENCY WITH THRESHOLD NO. 3

Would the expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The potential impact of Project-generated air pollutant emissions at sensitive receptors has also been considered. Results of the LST analysis indicate that the Project will not exceed the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds during construction. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during Project construction.

CO “HOT SPOT” ANALYSIS

As discussed below, the Project would not result in potentially adverse CO concentrations or “hot spots.” Further, detailed modeling of Project-specific CO “hot spots” is not needed to reach this conclusion. An adverse CO concentration, known as a “hot spot”, would occur if an exceedance of the state one-hour standard of 20 parts per million (ppm) or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm were to occur.

It has long been recognized that CO hotspots are caused by vehicular emissions, primarily when idling at congested intersections. In response, vehicle emissions standards have become increasingly stringent in the last twenty years. Currently, the allowable CO emissions standard in California is a maximum of 3.4 grams/mile for passenger cars (there are requirements for certain vehicles that are more stringent). With the turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels, and implementation of increasingly sophisticated and efficient emissions control technologies, CO concentration in the SCAB is now designated as attainment. To establish a more accurate record of baseline CO concentrations affecting the SCAB, a CO “hot spot” analysis was conducted in 2003 for four busy intersections in Los Angeles at the peak morning and afternoon time periods³. This “hot spot” analysis did not predict any exceedance of the 1-hour (20.0 ppm) or 8-hour (9.0 ppm) CO standards, as shown on Table 7.

³ The CO “hot spot” analysis conducted in 2003 is the most current study used for CO “hot spot” analysis in the SCAB.

TABLE 7: CO MODEL RESULTS

Intersection Location	CO Concentrations (ppm)		
	Morning 1-hour	Afternoon 1-hour	8-hour
Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue	4.6	3.5	3.7
Sunset Boulevard/Highland Avenue	4	4.5	3.5
La Cienega Boulevard/Century Boulevard	3.7	3.1	5.2
Long Beach Boulevard/Imperial Highway	3	3.1	8.4

Notes: Federal 1-hour standard is 35 ppm and the deferral 8-hour standard is 9.0 ppm.

Based on the SCAQMD's 2003 AQMP and the 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide (1992 CO Plan), peak carbon monoxide concentrations in the SCAB were a result of unusual meteorological and topographical conditions and not a result of traffic volumes and congestion at a particular intersection. As evidence of this, for example, 8.4 ppm 8-hr CO concentration measured at the Long Beach Blvd. and Imperial Hwy. intersection (highest CO generating intersection within the "hot spot" analysis), only 0.7 ppm was attributable to the traffic volumes and congestion at this intersection; the remaining 7.7 ppm were due to the ambient air measurements at the time the 2003 AQMP was prepared (14). In contrast, an adverse CO concentration, known as a "hot spot", would occur if an exceedance of the state one-hour standard of 20 parts per million (ppm) or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm were to occur.

Similar considerations are also employed by other Air Districts when evaluating potential CO concentration impacts. More specifically, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) concludes that under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a given project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour (vph)—or 24,000 vph where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix—in order to generate a significant CO impact (15). Traffic volumes generating the CO concentrations for the "hot spot" analysis is shown on Table 8. The busiest intersection evaluated was that at Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue, which has a daily traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vph and AM/PM traffic volumes of 8,062 vph and 7,719 vph respectively (16). The 2003 AQMP estimated that the 1-hour concentration for this intersection was 4.6 ppm; this indicates that, should the hourly traffic volume increase four times to 32,248 vehicles per hour, CO concentrations (4.6 ppm x 4 = 18.4 ppm) would still not likely exceed the most stringent 1-hour CO standard (20.0 ppm). Since the Project would not generate new ADT, the Project would not cause a CO hotspot.

TABLE 8: CO MODEL RESULTS

Intersection Location	Peak Traffic Volumes (vph)				
	Eastbound (AM/PM)	Westbound (AM/PM)	Southbound (AM/PM)	Northbound (AM/PM)	Total (AM/PM)
Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue	4,954/2,069	1,830/3,317	721/1,400	560/933	8,062/7,719
Sunset Boulevard/Highland Avenue	1,417/1,764	1,342/1,540	2,304/1,832	1,551/2,238	6,614/5,374
La Cienega Boulevard/Century Boulevard	2,540/2,243	1,890/2,728	1,384/2,029	821/1,674	6,634/8,674
Long Beach Boulevard/Imperial Highway	1,217/2,020	1,760/1,400	479/944	756/1,150	4,212/5,514

AIR QUALITY IMPACTS – CONSISTENCY WITH THRESHOLD NO. 4***Would the Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?***

The potential for the Project to generate objectionable odors has also been considered. Land uses generally associated with odor complaints include:

- Agricultural uses (livestock and farming)
- Wastewater treatment plants
- Food processing plants
- Chemical plants
- Composting operations
- Refineries
- Landfills
- Dairies
- Fiberglass molding facilities

The Project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors. Potential odor sources associated with the proposed Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities and the temporary storage of typical solid waste (refuse) associated with the proposed Project's (long-term operational) uses. Standard construction requirements would minimize odor impacts from construction. The construction odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction and is thus considered less than significant. It is expected that Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the solid waste regulations. The proposed Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors associated with the proposed Project construction and operations would be less than significant and no mitigation is required (17).

PROJECT GREENHOUSE GAS ANALYSIS

CLIMATE CHANGE SETTING

Global climate change (GCC) is the change in average meteorological conditions on the earth with respect to temperature, precipitation, and storms. The majority of scientists believe that the climate shift taking place since the Industrial Revolution is occurring at a quicker rate and magnitude than in the past. Scientific evidence suggests that GCC is the result of increased concentrations of GHGs in the earth's atmosphere, including carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and fluorinated gases. The majority of scientists believe that this increased rate of climate change is the result of GHGs resulting from human activity and industrialization over the past 200 years.

An individual project like the proposed Project evaluated in this memo cannot generate enough GHG emissions to affect a discernible change in global climate. However, the proposed Project may participate in the potential for GCC by its incremental contribution of GHGs combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of GHGs, which when taken together constitute potential influences on GCC. Because these changes may have serious environmental consequences, this memo will evaluate the potential for the proposed Project to have a significant effect upon the environment as a result of its potential contribution to the greenhouse effect.

GCC refers to the change in average meteorological conditions on the earth with respect to temperature, wind patterns, precipitation and storms. Global temperatures are regulated by naturally occurring atmospheric gases such as water vapor, CO₂, N₂O, CH₄, hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). These particular gases are important due to their residence time (duration they stay) in the atmosphere, which ranges from 10 years to more than 100 years. These gases allow solar radiation into the earth's atmosphere, but prevent radioactive heat from escaping, thus warming the earth's atmosphere. GCC can occur naturally as it has in the past with the previous ice ages.

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are often referred to as GHGs. GHGs are released into the atmosphere by both natural and anthropogenic activity. Without the natural GHG effect, the earth's average temperature would be approximately 61 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) cooler than it is currently. The cumulative accumulation of these gases in the earth's atmosphere is considered to be the cause for the observed increase in the earth's temperature.

For the purposes of this analysis, emissions of CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O were evaluated because these gases are the primary contributors to GCC from development projects. Although there are other substances such as fluorinated gases that also contribute to GCC, these fluorinated gases were not evaluated as their sources are not well-defined and do not contain accepted emissions factors or methodology to accurately calculate these gases.

REGULATORY SETTING

Executive Order S-3-05

Former California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger announced on June 1, 2005, through Executive Order S-3-05, the following reduction targets for GHG emissions:

- By 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels.

- By 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels.
- By 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels.

The 2050 reduction goal represents what some scientists believe is necessary to reach levels that will stabilize the climate. The 2020 goal was established to be a mid-term target. Because this is an executive order, the goals are not legally enforceable for local governments or the private sector.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32

The California State Legislature enacted AB 32, which requires that GHGs emitted in California be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. “GHGs” as defined under AB 32 include CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). Since AB 32 was enacted, a seventh chemical, nitrogen trifluoride, has also been added to the list of GHGs. CARB is the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of GHGs. Pursuant to AB 32, CARB adopted regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions. AB 32 states the following:

“Global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California. The potential adverse impacts of global warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences, damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems.”

CARB approved the 1990 GHG emissions level of 427 million metric ton of CO₂ equivalent per year (MMTCO₂e) on December 6, 2007 (18). Therefore, emissions generated in California in 2020 are required to be equal to or less than 427 MMTCO₂e. Emissions in 2020 in a “business as usual” (BAU) scenario were estimated to be 596 MMTCO₂e, which do not account for reductions from AB 32 regulations (19). At that level, a 28.4% reduction was required to achieve the 427 MMTCO₂e 1990 inventory. In October 2010, CARB prepared an updated BAU 2020 forecast to account for the recession and slower forecasted growth. The forecasted inventory without the benefits of adopted regulation is now estimated at 545 MMTCO₂e. Therefore, under the updated forecast, a 21.7% reduction from BAU is required to achieve 1990 levels (20).

Progress in Achieving AB 32 Targets and Remaining Reductions Required

The State has made steady progress in implementing AB 32 and achieving targets included in Executive Order S-3-05. The progress is shown in updated emission inventories prepared by CARB for 2000 through 2012 (21). The State has achieved the Executive Order S-3-05 target for 2010 of reducing GHG emissions to 2000 levels. As shown below, the 2010 emission inventory achieved this target.

- 1990: 427 MMTCO₂e (AB 32 2020 target)
- 2000: 463 MMTCO₂e (an average 8% reduction needed to achieve 1990 base)
- 2010: 450 MMTCO₂e (an average 5% reduction needed to achieve 1990 base)

CARB has also made substantial progress in achieving its goal of achieving 1990 emissions levels by 2020. As described earlier in this section, CARB revised the 2020 BAU inventory forecast to account for new lower growth projections, which resulted in a new lower reduction from BAU to achieve the 1990 base. The previous reduction from 2020 BAU needed to achieve 1990 levels was 28.4% and the latest reduction from 2020 BAU is 21.7%.

- 2020: 545 MMTCO₂e BAU (an average 21.7% reduction from BAU needed to achieve 1990 base)

Senate Bill (SB) 32

On September 8, 2016, Governor Jerry Brown signed the SB 32 and its companion bill, AB 197. SB 32 requires the state to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, a reduction target that was first introduced in Executive Order B-30-15. The new legislation builds upon the AB 32 goal of 1990 levels by 2020 and provides an intermediate goal to achieving S-3-05, which sets a statewide GHG reduction target of 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. AB 197 creates a legislative committee to oversee regulators to ensure that CARB not only responds to the Governor, but also the Legislature (22).

AB 197

A condition of approval for SB 32 was the passage of AB 197. AB 197 requires that CARB consider the social costs of GHG emissions and prioritize direct reductions in GHG emissions at mobile sources and large stationary sources. AB 197 also gives the California legislature more oversight over CARB through the addition of two legislatively appointed members to the CARB Board and the establishment a legislative committee to make recommendations about CARB programs to the legislature.

Executive Order B-55-18 and SB 100

Executive Order B-55-18 and SB 100. SB 100 and Executive Order B-55-18 were signed by Governor Brown on September 10, 2018. Under the existing RPS, 25% of retail sales are required to be from renewable sources by December 31, 2016, 33% by December 31, 2020, 40% by December 31, 2024, 45% by December 31, 2027, and 50% by December 31, 2030. SB 100 raises California's RPS requirement to 50% renewable resources target by December 31, 2026, and to achieve a 60% target by December 31, 2030. SB 100 also requires that retail sellers and local publicly owned electric utilities procure a minimum quantity of electricity products from eligible renewable energy resources so that the total kilowatt hours of those products sold to their retail end-use customers achieve 44% of retail sales by December 31, 2024, 52% by December 31, 2027, and 60% by December 31, 2030. In addition to targets under AB 32 and SB 32, Executive Order B-55-18 establishes a carbon neutrality goal for the state of California by 2045; and sets a goal to maintain net negative emissions thereafter. The Executive Order directs the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), the Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), and CARB to include sequestration targets in the Natural and Working Lands Climate Change Implementation Plan consistent with the carbon neutrality goal.

Title 24 California Code of Regulations (CCR)

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 Part 6: The California Energy Code was first adopted in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption.

The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficient technologies and methods. CCR, Title 24, Part 11: California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) is a comprehensive and uniform regulatory code for all residential, commercial, and school buildings that went in effect on August 1, 2009, and is administered by the California Building Standards Commission.

CALGreen is updated on a regular basis, with the most recent approved update consisting of the 2022 California Green Building Code Standards that will be effective on January 1, 2023⁴.

SCAQMD

SCAQMD is the agency responsible for air quality planning and regulation in the SCAB. The SCAQMD addresses the impacts to climate change of projects subject to SCAQMD permit as a lead agency if they are the only agency having discretionary approval for the project and acts as a responsible agency when a land use agency must also approve discretionary permits for the project. The SCAQMD acts as an expert commenting agency for impacts to air quality. This expertise carries over to GHG emissions, so the agency helps local land use agencies through the development of models and emission thresholds that can be used to address GHG emissions.

In 2008, SCAQMD formed a Working Group to identify GHG emissions thresholds for land use projects that could be used by local lead agencies in the SCAB. The Working Group developed several different options that are contained in the SCAQMD Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold, that could be applied by lead agencies. The working group has not provided additional guidance since release of the interim guidance in 2008. The SCAQMD Board has not approved the thresholds; however, the Guidance Document provides substantial evidence supporting the approaches to significance of GHG emissions that can be considered by the lead agency in adopting its own threshold. The current interim thresholds consist of the following tiered approach:

- Tier 1 consists of evaluating whether or not the project qualifies for any applicable exemption under CEQA.
- Tier 2 consists of determining whether the project is consistent with a GHG reduction plan. If a project is consistent with a qualifying local GHG reduction plan, it does not have significant GHG emissions.
- Tier 3 consists of screening values, which the lead agency can choose, but must be consistent with all projects within its jurisdiction. A project's construction emissions are averaged over 30 years and are added to the project's operational emissions. If a project's emissions are below one of the following screening thresholds, then the project is less than significant:
 - Residential and commercial land use: 3,000 metric ton of CO₂ equivalent (MTCO₂e/yr)
 - Industrial land use: 10,000 MTCO₂e/yr

⁴ The 2022 California Green Building Standard Code will be published July 1, 2022.

- Based on land use type: residential: 3,500 MTCO₂e/yr; commercial: 1,400 MTCO₂e/yr; or mixed use: 3,000 MTCO₂e/yr
- Tier 4 has the following options:
 - Option 1: Reduce Business-as-Usual (BAU) emissions by a certain percentage; this percentage is currently undefined.
 - Option 2: Early implementation of applicable AB 32 Scoping Plan measures
 - Option 3: 2020 target for service populations (SP), which includes residents and employees: 4.8 MTCO₂e per SP per year for projects and 6.6 MTCO₂e per SP per year for plans;
 - Option 3, 2035 target: 3.0 MTCO₂e per SP per year for projects and 4.1 MTCO₂e per SP per year for plans
- Tier 5 involves mitigation offsets to achieve target significance threshold.

The SCAQMD's interim thresholds used the Executive Order S-3-05-year 2050 goal as the basis for the Tier 3 screening level. Achieving the Executive Order's objective would contribute to worldwide efforts to cap CO₂ concentrations at 450 ppm, thus stabilizing global climate.

SCAQMD only has authority over GHG emissions from development projects that include air quality permits. At this time, it is unknown if the project would include stationary sources of emissions subject to SCAQMD permits. Notwithstanding, if the Project requires a stationary permit, it would be subject to the applicable SCAQMD regulations.

SCAQMD Regulation XXVII, adopted in 2009 includes the following rules:

- Rule 2700 defines terms and post global warming potentials.
- Rule 2701, Southern California (SoCal) Climate Solutions Exchange, establishes a voluntary program to encourage, quantify, and certify voluntary, high quality certified GHG emission reductions in the SCAQMD.
- Rule 2702, GHG Reduction Program created a program to produce GHG emission reductions within the SCAQMD. The SCAQMD will fund projects through contracts in response to requests for proposals or purchase reductions from other parties.

SCAQMD is the agency responsible for air quality planning and regulation in the SCAB. The SCAQMD addresses the impacts to climate change of projects subject to SCAQMD permit as a lead agency if they are the only agency having discretionary approval for the project and acts as a responsible agency when a land use agency must also approve discretionary permits for the project. The SCAQMD acts as an expert commenting agency for impacts to air quality. This expertise carries over to GHG emissions, so the agency helps local land use agencies through the development of models and emission thresholds that can be used to address GHG emissions.

County of Redlands Climate Action Plan

The City of Redland CAP was designed to reinforce the City of Redland commitment to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and demonstrate compliance with the State of California's GHG emission reduction standards (23). The CAP includes goals and policies to promote energy efficiency, waste reduction, and resource conservation and recycling. The CAP's GHG emission

targets and goals were based on meeting the goals in EO B-30-15 and SB 32 and following the guidance established in the 2017 Scoping Plan. The CAP used the 2017 Scoping Plan recommended Plan Level emissions target of 6.0 MTCO₂e per capita per year for 2030. Based on the CAP analysis, the City of Redland will achieve the 2030 target based on State actions and existing development standards and would not require any specific measures to reduce GHG emissions. Regardless, the CAP does recommend some actions including encourage the development of solar photovoltaic systems on residential and non-residential development, increase energy efficiency 5% over 2016 standards, increase the use of high efficiency lighting, and reduce the intensity of GHG emissions associated with water delivery and treatment.

GHG IMPACTS

Standards of Significance

According to the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G thresholds, to determine whether impacts from GHG emissions are significant. Would the project:

- **Threshold 1:** Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- **Threshold 2:** Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?

The evaluation of an impact under CEQA requires measuring data from a project against both existing conditions and a “threshold of significance.” For establishing significance thresholds, the Office of Planning and Research’s amendments to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(c) state “[w]hen adopting thresholds of significance, a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies, or recommended by experts, provided the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence.”

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(a) further states, “. . . A lead agency shall have discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to: (1) Use a model or methodology to quantify greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use . . .; or (2) Rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards.”

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 provides that a lead agency should consider the following factors, among others, in assessing the significance of impacts from greenhouse gas emissions:

- **Consideration #1:** The extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting.
- **Consideration #2:** Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project.
- **Consideration #3:** The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Such regulations or requirements must be adopted by the relevant public agency through a public review process and must reduce or mitigate the project’s incremental contribution of greenhouse gas emissions. In

determining the significance of impacts, the lead agency may consider a project's consistency with the State's long-term climate goals or strategies, provided that substantial evidence supports the agency's analysis of how those goals or strategies address the project's incremental contribution to climate change and its conclusion that the project's incremental contribution is not cumulatively considerable.

Discussion on Establishment of Significance Thresholds

Based on the foregoing guidance, the City of Redland has elected to rely on compliance with a local air district threshold in the determination of significance of Project-related GHG emissions. Specifically, the City has selected the interim 3,000 MTCO₂e per year threshold recommended by SCAQMD staff for residential and commercial sector projects against which to compare Project-related GHG emissions.

The 3,000 MTCO₂e per year threshold is based on a 90 percent emission "capture" rate methodology. Prior to its use by the SCAQMD, the 90 percent emissions capture approach was one of the options suggested by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in their CEQA & Climate Change white paper (2008). A 90 percent emission capture rate means that unmitigated GHG emissions from the top 90 percent of all GHG-producing projects within a geographic area – the SCAB in this instance – would be subject to a detailed analysis of potential environmental impacts from GHG emissions, while the bottom 10 percent of all GHG-producing projects would be excluded from detailed analysis. A GHG significance threshold based on a 90 percent emission capture rate is appropriate to address the long-term adverse impacts associated with global climate change because medium and large projects will be required to implement measures to reduce GHG emissions, while small projects, which are generally infill development projects that are not the focus of the State's GHG reduction targets, are allowed to proceed. Further, a 90 percent emission capture rate sets the emission threshold low enough to capture a substantial proportion of future development projects and demonstrate that cumulative emissions reductions are being achieved while setting the emission threshold high enough to exclude small projects that will, in aggregate, contribute approximate 1 percent of projected statewide GHG emissions in the Year 2050 (24).

In setting the threshold at 3,000 MTCO₂e per year, SCAQMD researched a database of projects kept by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). That database contained 798 projects, 87 of which were removed because they were very large projects and/or outliers that would skew emissions values too high, leaving 711 as the sample population to use in determining the 90th percentile capture rate. The SCAQMD analysis of the 711 projects within the sample population combined commercial, residential, and mixed-use projects. It should be noted that the sample of projects included warehouses and other light industrial land uses but did not include industrial processes (i.e., oil refineries, heavy manufacturing, electric generating stations, mining operations, etc.). Emissions from each of these projects were calculated by SCAQMD to provide a consistent method of emissions calculations across the sample population and from projects within the sample population. In calculating the emissions, the SCAQMD analysis determined that the 90th percentile ranged between 2,983 to 3,143 MTCO₂e per year. The SCAQMD set their significance threshold at the low-end value of the range when rounded to the nearest hundred tons of emissions (i.e., 3,000 MTCO₂e per year) to define small projects that are considered less than significant and do not need to provide further analysis.

The City understands that the 3,000 MTCO₂e per year threshold for residential/commercial uses was proposed by SCAQMD a decade ago and was adopted as an interim policy; however, no permanent, superseding policy or threshold has since been adopted. The 3,000 MTCO₂e per year threshold was developed and recommended by SCAQMD, an expert agency, based on substantial evidence as provided in the Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas Significance Threshold (2008) document and subsequent Working Group meetings (latest of which occurred in 2010). SCAQMD has not withdrawn its support of the interim threshold and all documentation supporting the interim threshold remains on the SCAQMD website on a page that provides guidance to CEQA practitioners for air quality analysis (and where all SCAQMD significance thresholds for regional and local criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants also are listed). Further, as stated by SCAQMD, this threshold “uses the Executive Order S-3-05 goal [80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050] as the basis for deriving the screening level” and, thus, remains valid for use in 2022 (24). Lastly, this threshold has been used for hundreds, if not thousands of GHG analyses performed for projects located within the SCAQMD jurisdiction.

Thus, for purposes of analysis in this analysis, if Project-related GHG emissions do not exceed the 3,000 MTCO₂e per year threshold, then Project-related GHG emissions would clearly have a less-than-significant impact pursuant to Threshold GHG-1. On the other hand, if Project-related GHG emissions exceed 3,000 MTCO₂e per year, the Project would be considered a substantial source of GHG emissions.

GHG IMPACTS – CONSISTENCY WITH THRESHOLD NO. 1

Would the Project have the potential to generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that would result in a significant impact on the environment?

PROJECT GHG EMISSIONS

The estimated GHG emissions for the Project land use are summarized on Table 6. The estimated GHG emission include emissions from Carbon Dioxide (CO₂), Methane (CH₄), Nitrous Oxide (N₂O), and Refrigerants (R).

It should be noted that there are no quantifiable GHG emissions associated with operations with the proposed Project. As such, the GHG emissions presented on Table 9 are from construction source GHG emissions and would generate a total of approximately 15.73 MTCO₂e/yr.

TABLE 9: TOTAL PROJECT GHG EMISSIONS

Year	Emission (MT/yr)				
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	R	Total CO ₂ E
2024	469.74	0.02	0.01	0.06	471.93
Total GHG Emissions	469.74	0.02	0.01	0.06	471.93
Amortized Construction Emissions	15.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.73
Total CO₂E (All Sources)	15.73				

A numerical threshold for determining the significance of GHG emissions in the SCAB has not been established by the SCAQMD for projects where it is not the lead agency. As an interim

threshold based on guidance provided in the CAPCOA *CEQA and Climate Change* handbook, the City has opted to use a non-zero threshold approach based on Approach 2 of the handbook. Threshold 2.5 (Unit-Based Thresholds Based on Market Capture) establishes a numerical threshold based on capture of approximately 90% of emissions from future development. The latest threshold developed by SCAQMD using this method is 3,000 MTCO₂e/yr for all projects (25).

The Project would result in approximately 15.73 MTCO₂e/yr; the proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's numeric threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e/yr. Thus, the Project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to GHG emissions.

GHG IMPACTS – CONSISTENCY WITH THRESHOLD NO. 2

Would the Project have the potential to conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?

Pursuant to 15604.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, a lead agency may rely on qualitative analysis or performance-based standards to determine the significance of impacts from GHG emissions (26).

In November 2022, CARB released the Final 2022 Scoping Plan Update, which identifies the State's progress towards the statutory 2030 target, while providing a path towards carbon neutrality and reduce greenhouse gases emissions by 85% below 1990 levels by 2045. Recent studies show that the State's existing and proposed regulatory framework will allow the State to reduce its GHG emissions level to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030 (27). The Project would not conflict with any of the 2022 Scoping Plan elements as any regulations adopted would apply directly or indirectly to the Project.

Finally, the Project is consistent with the general plan land use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the Project area in SCAG's Sustainable Community Strategy/Regional Transportation Plan, which pursuant to SB 375 calls for the integration of transportation, land-use and housing policies to plan for achievement of the GHG-emissions target for the region. Thus, a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions from Project construction and operation would occur and no mitigation is required.

AIR QUALITY & GREENHOUSE GAS CONCLUSION

Results of the assessment indicate that the Project is not anticipated to result in a significant impact during construction activities and due to no associated primary sources, for operations with air quality and greenhouse gas and no mitigation is required.

REFERENCES

1. **Air Resources Board.** California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). [Online] 2009. [Cited: April 16, 2018.] <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/caaqs/caaqs.htm>.
2. **Environmental Protection Agency.** National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). [Online] 1990. <https://www.epa.gov/environmental-topics/air-topics>.
3. **South Coast Air Quality Management District.** RULE 403. FUGITIVE DUST. [Online] <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-403.pdf?sfvrsn=4>.
4. —. RULE 1113. Architectural Coatings. [Online] <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xi/r1113.pdf>.
5. **California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA).** California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). [Online] May 2022. www.caleemod.com.
6. **State of California.** 2020 CEQA California Environmental Quality Act. 2020.
7. **South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).** SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds. [Online] <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf?sfvrsn=2>.
8. **State of California.** 2020 CEQA California Environmental Quality Act. 2020.
9. **South Coast Air Quality Management District.** *Localized Significance Thresholds Methodology*. s.l. : South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2003.
10. —. Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). [Online] March 2017. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2016-air-quality-management-plan/final-2016-aqmp/final2016aqmp.pdf?sfvrsn=11>.
11. **Southern California Association of Governments.** 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. [Online] September 2020. https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/0903fconnectsocial-plan_0.pdf?1606001176.
12. **South Coast Air Quality Management District.** *CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993)*. 1993.
13. **Goss, Tracy A and Kroeger, Amy.** White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution. [Online] South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2003. http://www.aqmd.gov/rules/ciwg/final_white_paper.pdf.
14. **South Coast Air Quality Management District.** 2003 Air Quality Management Plan. [Online] 2003. <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan/2003-aqmp>.
15. **Bay Area Air Quality Management District.** [Online] <http://www.baaqmd.gov/>.
16. **South Coast Air Quality Management District.** 2003 Air Quality Management Plan. [Online] 2003. <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan/2003-aqmp>.

17. —. RULE 402 NUISANCE. [Online] <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-402.pdf>.
18. **California Air Resources Board.** GHG 1990 Emissions Level & 2020 Limit. *California Air Resources Board*. [Online] <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/ghg-2020-limit>.
19. —. *Climate Change Draft Scoping Plan*. 2008.
20. —. STATUS OF SCOPING PLAN RECOMMENDED MEASURES. [Online] [Cited: September 19, 2019.] https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/status_of_scoping_plan_measures.pdf.
21. —. *First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan*. 2014.
22. **California Legislative Information.** Senate Bill No. 32. [Online] September 8, 2016. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160SB32.
23. **City of Redlands.** *City of Redlands Climate Action Plan*. Redlands, CA : s.n., December 2017.
24. **South Coast Air Quality Management District.** *Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans*. Diamond Bar : s.n., 2008.
25. —. Interim CEQA GHG Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans. [Online] December 5, 2008. [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-\(ghg\)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgboardsynopsis.pdf](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgboardsynopsis.pdf).
26. **Association of Environmental Professionals.** *2018 CEQA California Environmental Quality Act*. 2018.
27. **Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.** California's Policies Can Significantly Cut Greenhouse Gas Emissions through 2030. *Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory*. [Online] January 22, 2015. <http://newscenter.lbl.gov/2015/01/22/californias-policies-can-significantly-cut-greenhouse-gas-emissions-2030/>.

ATTACHMENT A

CALEEMOD PROPOSED PROJECT EMISSIONS MODEL OUTPUTS

15092 California St. and Redlands Blvd. Detailed Report

Table of Contents

- 1. Basic Project Information
 - 1.1. Basic Project Information
 - 1.2. Land Use Types
 - 1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector
- 2. Emissions Summary
 - 2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds
 - 2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated
- 3. Construction Emissions Details
 - 3.1. Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing (2024) - Unmitigated
 - 3.3. Linear, Grading & Excavation (2024) - Unmitigated
 - 3.5. Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade (2024) - Unmitigated
 - 3.7. Linear, Paving (2024) - Unmitigated
- 4. Operations Emissions Details
 - 4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type

4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type - Unmitigated

4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type - Unmitigated

4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species - Unmitigated

5. Activity Data

5.1. Construction Schedule

5.2. Off-Road Equipment

5.2.1. Unmitigated

5.3. Construction Vehicles

5.3.1. Unmitigated

5.4. Vehicles

5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

5.5. Architectural Coatings

5.6. Dust Mitigation

5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

5.7. Construction Paving

5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

5.18. Vegetation

5.18.1. Land Use Change

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.2. Sequestration

5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

6.1. Climate Risk Summary

6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures

7. Health and Equity Details

7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores

7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores

7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

7.4. Health & Equity Measures

7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures

8. User Changes to Default Data

1. Basic Project Information

1.1. Basic Project Information

Data Field	Value
Project Name	15092 California St. and Redlands Blvd.
Construction Start Date	4/3/2024
Lead Agency	—
Land Use Scale	Project/site
Analysis Level for Defaults	County
Windspeed (m/s)	2.50
Precipitation (days)	24.0
Location	34.063215, -117.226212
County	San Bernardino-South Coast
City	Redlands
Air District	South Coast AQMD
Air Basin	South Coast
TAZ	5394
EDFZ	10
Electric Utility	Southern California Edison
Gas Utility	Southern California Gas
App Version	2022.1.1.8

1.2. Land Use Types

Land Use Subtype	Size	Unit	Lot Acreage	Building Area (sq ft)	Landscape Area (sq ft)	Special Landscape Area (sq ft)	Population	Description
Road Widening	< 0.005	Mile	0.63	0.00	—	—	—	—

1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector

No measures selected

2. Emissions Summary

2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Un/Mit.	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	5.06	4.26	37.4	41.4	0.07	1.72	1.52	3.24	1.58	0.24	1.82	—	8,347	8,347	0.35	0.10	2.59	8,389
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	2.59	2.18	19.5	22.2	0.04	0.81	0.77	1.58	0.74	0.13	0.87	—	4,452	4,452	0.18	0.05	0.04	4,471
Average Daily (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	1.72	1.45	12.8	14.4	0.02	0.58	0.51	1.09	0.53	0.08	0.61	—	2,855	2,855	0.12	0.03	0.42	2,868
Annual (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	0.31	0.26	2.33	2.62	< 0.005	0.11	0.09	0.20	0.10	0.01	0.11	—	473	473	0.02	0.01	0.07	475

2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Year	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Daily - Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

2024	5.06	4.26	37.4	41.4	0.07	1.72	1.52	3.24	1.58	0.24	1.82	—	8,347	8,347	0.35	0.10	2.59	8,389
Daily - Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2024	2.59	2.18	19.5	22.2	0.04	0.81	0.77	1.58	0.74	0.13	0.87	—	4,452	4,452	0.18	0.05	0.04	4,471
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2024	1.72	1.45	12.8	14.4	0.02	0.58	0.51	1.09	0.53	0.08	0.61	—	2,855	2,855	0.12	0.03	0.42	2,868
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2024	0.31	0.26	2.33	2.62	< 0.005	0.11	0.09	0.20	0.10	0.01	0.11	—	473	473	0.02	0.01	0.07	475

3. Construction Emissions Details

3.1. Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing (2024) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.63	0.53	4.53	4.54	0.01	0.27	—	0.27	0.25	—	0.25	—	632	632	0.03	0.01	—	634
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.14	0.14	—	0.01	0.01	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.03	0.03	0.24	0.24	< 0.005	0.01	—	0.01	0.01	—	0.01	—	32.9	32.9	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	33.0
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.01	0.01	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.04	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	—	5.45	5.45	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	5.47
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.85	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.13	0.00	0.03	0.03	—	144	144	0.01	< 0.005	0.58	146
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	6.97	6.97	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	7.06
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	1.15	1.15	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.17
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.3. Linear, Grading & Excavation (2024) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	4.81	4.05	37.0	37.9	0.07	1.71	—	1.71	1.58	—	1.58	—	7,644	7,644	0.31	0.06	—	7,670
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.97	0.97	—	0.10	0.10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.13	0.95	8.73	8.93	0.02	0.40	—	0.40	0.37	—	0.37	—	1,801	1,801	0.07	0.01	—	1,807
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.23	0.23	—	0.02	0.02	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.21	0.17	1.59	1.63	< 0.005	0.07	—	0.07	0.07	—	0.07	—	298	298	0.01	< 0.005	—	299
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.04	0.04	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.23	0.21	0.19	3.38	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.52	0.00	0.12	0.12	—	576	576	0.02	0.02	2.30	585
Vendor	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.04	0.02	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	31.4	31.4	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.09	32.9
Hauling	0.01	< 0.005	0.12	0.07	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	—	95.8	95.8	0.01	0.02	0.20	101
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.63	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.12	0.00	0.03	0.03	—	126	126	0.01	< 0.005	0.23	128
Vendor	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	7.39	7.39	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	7.74
Hauling	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.03	0.02	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	22.6	22.6	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	23.7
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	—	20.9	20.9	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.04	21.2
Vendor	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	1.22	1.22	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.28
Hauling	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	3.74	3.74	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	3.93

3.5. Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade (2024) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	2.44	2.04	19.3	20.4	0.04	0.81	—	0.81	0.74	—	0.74	—	4,089	4,089	0.17	0.03	—	4,103
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.41	0.41	—	0.04	0.04	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	2.44	2.04	19.3	20.4	0.04	0.81	—	0.81	0.74	—	0.74	—	4,089	4,089	0.17	0.03	—	4,103
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.41	0.41	—	0.04	0.04	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.38	0.32	3.02	3.19	0.01	0.13	—	0.13	0.12	—	0.12	—	639	639	0.03	0.01	—	641
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.06	0.06	—	0.01	0.01	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.07	0.06	0.55	0.58	< 0.005	0.02	—	0.02	0.02	—	0.02	—	106	106	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	106
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.01	0.01	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.16	0.14	0.13	2.33	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.36	0.00	0.08	0.08	—	396	396	0.02	0.01	1.58	402
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.15	0.14	0.16	1.76	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.36	0.00	0.08	0.08	—	363	363	0.02	0.01	0.04	367
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.01	—	57.5	57.5	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.11	58.3
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	9.51	9.51	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	9.65
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
---------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	---	------	------	------	------	------	------

3.7. Linear, Paving (2024) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.10	0.93	8.43	11.8	0.02	0.40	—	0.40	0.37	—	0.37	—	1,769	1,769	0.07	0.01	—	1,775
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.09	0.07	0.67	0.94	< 0.005	0.03	—	0.03	0.03	—	0.03	—	141	141	0.01	< 0.005	—	141
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.02	0.01	0.12	0.17	< 0.005	0.01	—	0.01	0.01	—	0.01	—	23.3	23.3	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	23.3
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.11	0.10	0.11	1.28	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.26	0.00	0.06	0.06	—	264	264	0.01	0.01	0.03	267
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	21.3	21.3	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.04	21.6
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	3.52	3.52	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	3.57
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

4. Operations Emissions Details

4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type

4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Vegetation	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Land Use	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Species	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avoided	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Sequest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Remove d	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avoided	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sequest ered	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Remove d	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avoided	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sequest ered	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Remove d	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

5. Activity Data

5.1. Construction Schedule

Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Days Per Week	Work Days per Phase	Phase Description
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	4/3/2024	4/29/2024	5.00	19.0	—
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Linear, Grading & Excavation	4/30/2024	8/28/2024	5.00	86.0	—
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	8/29/2024	11/16/2024	5.00	57.0	—
Linear, Paving	Linear, Paving	11/17/2024	12/27/2024	5.00	29.0	—

5.2. Off-Road Equipment

5.2.1. Unmitigated

Phase Name	Equipment Type	Fuel Type	Engine Tier	Number per Day	Hours Per Day	Horsepower	Load Factor
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	Crawler Tractors	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	87.0	0.43
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	Excavators	Diesel	Average	2.00	8.00	36.0	0.38
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	Signal Boards	Electric	Average	1.00	8.00	6.00	0.82
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Crawler Tractors	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	87.0	0.43
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Excavators	Diesel	Average	3.00	8.00	36.0	0.38
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Graders	Diesel	Average	2.00	8.00	148	0.41
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Rollers	Diesel	Average	2.00	8.00	36.0	0.38

Linear, Grading & Excavation	Rubber Tired Loaders	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	150	0.36
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Scrapers	Diesel	Average	2.00	8.00	423	0.48
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Signal Boards	Electric	Average	1.00	8.00	6.00	0.82
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	Diesel	Average	4.00	8.00	84.0	0.37
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Air Compressors	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	37.0	0.48
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Generator Sets	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	14.0	0.74
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Graders	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	148	0.41
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Plate Compactors	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	8.00	0.43
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Pumps	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	11.0	0.74
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Rough Terrain Forklifts	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	96.0	0.40
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Scrapers	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	423	0.48
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Signal Boards	Electric	Average	1.00	8.00	6.00	0.82
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	Diesel	Average	3.00	8.00	84.0	0.37
Linear, Paving	Pavers	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	81.0	0.42
Linear, Paving	Paving Equipment	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	89.0	0.36
Linear, Paving	Rollers	Diesel	Average	2.00	8.00	36.0	0.38
Linear, Paving	Signal Boards	Electric	Average	1.00	8.00	6.00	0.82
Linear, Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	Diesel	Average	3.00	8.00	84.0	0.37

5.3. Construction Vehicles

5.3.1. Unmitigated

Phase Name	Trip Type	One-Way Trips per Day	Miles per Trip	Vehicle Mix
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	—	—	—	—
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	Worker	10.0	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	Vendor	—	10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT
Linear, Grading & Excavation	—	—	—	—
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Worker	40.0	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Vendor	1.00	10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Hauling	1.36	20.0	HHDT
Linear, Grading & Excavation	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	—	—	—	—
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Worker	27.5	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Vendor	—	10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT
Linear, Paving	—	—	—	—
Linear, Paving	Worker	20.0	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Linear, Paving	Vendor	—	10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Linear, Paving	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Linear, Paving	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT

5.4. Vehicles

5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user.

5.5. Architectural Coatings

Phase Name	Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Parking Area Coated (sq ft)
------------	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------

5.6. Dust Mitigation

5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

Phase Name	Material Imported (cy)	Material Exported (cy)	Acres Graded (acres)	Material Demolished (sq. ft.)	Acres Paved (acres)
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	—	—	0.63	0.00	—
Linear, Grading & Excavation	—	929	0.63	0.00	—
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	—	—	0.63	0.00	—

5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

Control Strategies Applied	Frequency (per day)	PM10 Reduction	PM2.5 Reduction
Water Exposed Area	3	74%	74%

5.7. Construction Paving

Land Use	Area Paved (acres)	% Asphalt
Road Widening	0.63	100%

5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

kWh per Year and Emission Factor (lb/MWh)

Year	kWh per Year	CO2	CH4	N2O
2024	117	532	0.03	< 0.005

5.18. Vegetation

5.18.1. Land Use Change

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

Vegetation Land Use Type	Vegetation Soil Type	Initial Acres	Final Acres
--------------------------	----------------------	---------------	-------------

5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

Biomass Cover Type	Initial Acres	Final Acres
--------------------	---------------	-------------

5.18.2. Sequestration

5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

Tree Type	Number	Electricity Saved (kWh/year)	Natural Gas Saved (btu/year)
-----------	--------	------------------------------	------------------------------

6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

6.1. Climate Risk Summary

Cal-Adapt midcentury 2040–2059 average projections for four hazards are reported below for your project location. These are under Representation Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5 which assumes GHG emissions will continue to rise strongly through 2050 and then plateau around 2100.

Climate Hazard	Result for Project Location	Unit
Temperature and Extreme Heat	26.6	annual days of extreme heat
Extreme Precipitation	4.20	annual days with precipitation above 20 mm

Sea Level Rise	0.00	meters of inundation depth
Wildfire	6.46	annual hectares burned

Temperature and Extreme Heat data are for grid cell in which your project are located. The projection is based on the 98th historical percentile of daily maximum/minimum temperatures from observed historical data (32 climate model ensemble from Cal-Adapt, 2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

Extreme Precipitation data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The threshold of 20 mm is equivalent to about ¾ an inch of rain, which would be light to moderate rainfall if received over a full day or heavy rain if received over a period of 2 to 4 hours. Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

Sea Level Rise data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from Radke et al. (2017), as reported in Cal-Adapt (2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5), and consider different increments of sea level rise coupled with extreme storm events. Users may select from four model simulations to view the range in potential inundation depth for the grid cell. The four simulations make different assumptions about expected rainfall and temperature are: Warmer/drier (HadGEM2-ES), Cooler/wetter (CNRM-CM5), Average conditions (CanESM2), Range of different rainfall and temperature possibilities (MIROC5). Each grid cell is 50 meters (m) by 50 m, or about 164 feet (ft) by 164 ft.

Wildfire data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from UC Davis, as reported in Cal-Adapt (2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5), and consider historical data of climate, vegetation, population density, and large (> 400 ha) fire history. Users may select from four model simulations to view the range in potential wildfire probabilities for the grid cell. The four simulations make different assumptions about expected rainfall and temperature are: Warmer/drier (HadGEM2-ES), Cooler/wetter (CNRM-CM5), Average conditions (CanESM2), Range of different rainfall and temperature possibilities (MIROC5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

Climate Hazard	Exposure Score	Sensitivity Score	Adaptive Capacity Score	Vulnerability Score
Temperature and Extreme Heat	3	0	0	N/A
Extreme Precipitation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sea Level Rise	1	0	0	N/A
Wildfire	1	0	0	N/A
Flooding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Drought	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Snowpack Reduction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air Quality Degradation	0	0	0	N/A

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.

The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.

The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores do not include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

Climate Hazard	Exposure Score	Sensitivity Score	Adaptive Capacity Score	Vulnerability Score
----------------	----------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------

Temperature and Extreme Heat	3	1	1	3
Extreme Precipitation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sea Level Rise	1	1	1	2
Wildfire	1	1	1	2
Flooding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Drought	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Snowpack Reduction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air Quality Degradation	1	1	1	2

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.

The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.

The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures

7. Health and Equity Details

7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores

The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.

Indicator	Result for Project Census Tract
Exposure Indicators	—
AQ-Ozone	100
AQ-PM	57.4
AQ-DPM	82.8
Drinking Water	96.3
Lead Risk Housing	29.2
Pesticides	74.7
Toxic Releases	44.2

Traffic	81.0
Effect Indicators	—
CleanUp Sites	81.9
Groundwater	47.6
Haz Waste Facilities/Generators	96.8
Impaired Water Bodies	12.5
Solid Waste	0.00
Sensitive Population	—
Asthma	34.7
Cardio-vascular	45.1
Low Birth Weights	75.6
Socioeconomic Factor Indicators	—
Education	39.2
Housing	89.1
Linguistic	17.3
Poverty	55.9
Unemployment	14.4

7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores

The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

Indicator	Result for Project Census Tract
Economic	—
Above Poverty	37.76466059
Employed	27.51186963
Median HI	26.53663544
Education	—
Bachelor's or higher	60.5800077

High school enrollment	100
Preschool enrollment	11.52316181
Transportation	—
Auto Access	62.47914795
Active commuting	28.56409598
Social	—
2-parent households	37.02040293
Voting	39.83061722
Neighborhood	—
Alcohol availability	30.07827538
Park access	50.53252919
Retail density	65.94379571
Supermarket access	72.28281791
Tree canopy	43.62889773
Housing	—
Homeownership	9.303220839
Housing habitability	37.12305916
Low-inc homeowner severe housing cost burden	73.38637239
Low-inc renter severe housing cost burden	66.31592455
Uncrowded housing	31.19466188
Health Outcomes	—
Insured adults	48.58206082
Arthritis	92.2
Asthma ER Admissions	65.8
High Blood Pressure	95.2
Cancer (excluding skin)	82.6
Asthma	30.0

Coronary Heart Disease	94.7
Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease	71.2
Diagnosed Diabetes	92.6
Life Expectancy at Birth	79.7
Cognitively Disabled	52.2
Physically Disabled	60.6
Heart Attack ER Admissions	32.7
Mental Health Not Good	41.5
Chronic Kidney Disease	95.6
Obesity	56.2
Pedestrian Injuries	53.3
Physical Health Not Good	67.2
Stroke	91.3
Health Risk Behaviors	—
Binge Drinking	13.6
Current Smoker	36.3
No Leisure Time for Physical Activity	67.1
Climate Change Exposures	—
Wildfire Risk	0.0
SLR Inundation Area	0.0
Children	7.3
Elderly	81.9
English Speaking	84.0
Foreign-born	37.0
Outdoor Workers	85.1
Climate Change Adaptive Capacity	—
Impervious Surface Cover	69.4

Traffic Density	74.6
Traffic Access	23.0
Other Indices	—
Hardship	54.2
Other Decision Support	—
2016 Voting	58.0

7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

Metric	Result for Project Census Tract
CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Score for Project Location (a)	72.0
Healthy Places Index Score for Project Location (b)	32.0
Project Located in a Designated Disadvantaged Community (Senate Bill 535)	No
Project Located in a Low-Income Community (Assembly Bill 1550)	Yes
Project Located in a Community Air Protection Program Community (Assembly Bill 617)	No

a: The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.

b: The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

7.4. Health & Equity Measures

No Health & Equity Measures selected.

7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

Health & Equity Evaluation Scorecard not completed.

7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures

No Health & Equity Custom Measures created.

8. User Changes to Default Data

Screen	Justification
Construction: Off-Road Equipment	1 signal board assumed per phase