

## APPENDIX G

### ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS CHECKLIST FORM

**1. Project Title:**

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Rule 67.26 - Commercial Charbroiling Operations

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District  
(District) 10124 Old Grove Road  
San Diego, CA 92131

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Eric Luther (858) 586-2600

**4. Project Location:**

All of San Diego County

**5. Description of Project:**


Rule 67.26 would apply to new and existing chain-driven charbroilers that cook over 415 pounds weekly at commercial cooking facilities in San Diego County. Commercial charbroilers are cooking devices that use very high temperature to cook food and create a charred/smoky flavor. However, charbroilers generate smoke and air pollutants such as particulate matter (PM), and volatile organic compounds known as VOCs. Charbroiling makes up about 13% of the overall inventory of particulate matter (PM)<sub>2.5</sub> emissions in San Diego County. VOCs are gases that can react with other gases and existing air pollutants, contributing to ground-level ozone.

The Rule 67.26 applicability is based upon limits in other comparable California air district rules and is intended to avoid limited-use charbroilers from having to install emission controls. In most cases, chain-driven charbroiler facilities subject to the proposed new rule would need to register their equipment, install a certified flameless catalytic oxidizer that will control 83% of PM emissions and 86% of VOC emissions from each unit, properly maintain their equipment, and keep records of their operations. This emission reduction technology has been in place for over 2 decades in some other air districts around the state. Therefore, the District anticipates such technology being readily available for facilities to install.

**6. Surrounding Land Use and Setting**

San Diego County is a region that includes a wide variety of land uses and geographic features. The jurisdiction of rules passed by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Governing Board include the whole of San Diego County, including all cities within and the un-incorporated areas of the County. The District estimates approximately 200 food facilities (197) that are known or are likely to use a chain-driven charbroiler could be subject to Rule 67.26. Based on data collected, most of these restaurants identified likely currently operate without any emission controls installed. The District estimates that combined these facilities emit approximately 24 tons of PM<sub>2.5</sub> per year and 7.5 tons of VOCs per year. If Rule 67.26 is adopted by the Governing Board, the District estimates approximately 20 tons of PM<sub>2.5</sub> and 6 tons of VOCs per year would be reduced upon full implementation of the rule. Using EPA's Co-Benefits Risk Assessment tool, this emission reduction translates to annually reducing up to 450 minor restricted activity and lost workdays, and up to 240 negative health incidents, such as acute bronchitis, respiratory symptoms, asthma emergency room visits, and hospital admissions.

Figure1.- Map of Potentially Subject Facilities



**7. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:**

None

**8. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

No, California Native American tribes have not requested consultation for this project.

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors, as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture / Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources        | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils               | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions         | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality     | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning              | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing             | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

**DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Digitally signed by Eric Luther

**Eric Luther**

Date: 2025.03.07 14:26:55 -08'00

3/7/25

Signature

Date

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities (indoor) meeting the applicability of the rule. Therefore, there is no impact relating to scenic vistas or visual character of the site. The project does not propose any changes to the outdoor lighting for the site, therefore there is no impact relating to the creation of new sources of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment <u>project</u>; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within the building footprint of existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule. Project implementation would thus not convert prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance to nonagricultural use; conflict with agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract; convert forest land to non-forest use; or involve other changes that might ultimately result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on agricultural resources.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment (such as a catalytic oxidizer) within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule. The purpose of this rule is to reduce PM and VOC emissions from restaurant equipment exhaust. Based on data from other air districts including the South Coast Air Quality Management District, there is a minimum control efficiency of 83% for PM and 86% for VOC. Based on these control efficiency factors it is estimated that there will be emission reductions of 20.6 tons/year of PM and 6.5 tons/year VOC. Table 1 below shows the baseline emissions and controlled emissions assuming 197 chain-driven charbroilers in San Diego County.

Table 1:

Baseline Emissions		
Uncontrolled Emissions	PM	VOC
(lbs/week)	4.82	1.48
(tons/year)	0.13	0.04
<b>Total Uncontrolled Emissions (tons/year)</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>7.6</b>
Emission Reductions		
Controlled Emissions	PM	VOC
(lbs/week)	0.82	0.21
(tons/year)	0.02	0.01
<b>Total Controlled Emissions (tons/year)</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>
(tons/year)	0.10	0.03
<b>Total Emission Reductions (tons/year)</b>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>6.5</b>

*using min. control efficiency of 83% for PM and 86% for VOC emissions.*

Since the adoption of this rule will reduce emissions there will be no exceedance of any air quality significance thresholds during the operational phase of the adoption of this rule. During the construction phase there will be negligible emissions from extra vehicle trips from installation and inspection of the catalytic oxidizers. However, as these types of controls are generally pre-fabricated devices that attach to the charbroiler, construction impacts are expected to be minor. The adoption of Rule 67.26 will also have a direct effect on the modification of existing District Rules 11, 12 and 40. Rules 11 and 12 are for exemptions to permitting requirements and registering air pollution control equipment. Rule 40 only requires fees for permitting actions taken by an applicant. The changes to these three rules are administrative only and will not have any effect on air quality. The modification of these rules is also categorically exempt from CEQA (14 CCR section 15308) and a General Rule Exemption (14 CCR section 15061 (b)(3)) which is commonly referred to as the "common sense exemption". Because of this information, the adoption of Rule 67.26 will not affect any air quality plan, not increase any criteria pollutants, not expose any sensitive receptors to pollutants or cause odors to a significant number of people.



Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) <u>Have</u> a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <u>Have</u> a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <u>Have</u> a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would have no effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; would have no effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; and would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances, protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; and would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on biological resources.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within the building footprint of existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource; would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; and would not unlawfully disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on cultural resources.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. ENERGY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule. Any additional energy required to operate the control device will be minimal, as charboiler emissions are pushed through the control device in the exhaust stack. Project implementation would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or conflict with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on energy resources.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable <u>as a result of</u> the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative <u>waste water</u> disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would not expose people to the risk of loss, injury, or death associated with earthquakes, seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction or landslides. It would not result in soil erosion, loss of topsoil, be located on soil that is unstable, or located on expansive soil. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on geology/soils.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment (catalytic oxidizer) within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule. The purpose of this rule is to reduce PM and VOC emissions from restaurant equipment exhaust. Based on data from other air districts including the South Coast Air Quality Management District, there is a minimum control efficiency of 83% for PM and 86% for VOC. Based on these control efficiency factors it is estimated that there will be emission reductions of 20.6 tons/year of PM and 6.5 tons/year VOC. Reducing VOCs will reduce the formation of ground level ozone which is a secondary pollutant which is formed from when VOCS react with nitrogen oxides in the presence of sunlight. Ozone is considered a greenhouse gas as it traps the sun's radiation and increases temperature. Therefore, reductions of VOC emissions results in an indirect reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Adoption of Rule 67.26 will not generate greenhouse gas emissions that will have a significant impact on the environment nor conflict with any plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gases.

**APPENDIX G**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule. No hazardous waste will be produced in the process.

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, create a significant hazard to the public due to an accident or upset condition, or create hazardous emissions, materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a school. The rule will not impact sites included on a list of hazardous materials or result in any safety hazards or excessive noise for people near a public airport. The project will not impair or interfere with adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. The project will not increase exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death due to wildland fires. Therefore, this project will not create any impacts to hazards and hazardous materials.

APPENDIX G

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or <u>off-site</u> ;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or <u>offsite</u> ;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of a catalytic oxidizers within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule. Standard maintenance procedure involves soaking the catalyst in water every 3 to 6 months to remove the residue build-up. If soaked once every three months in 10 gallons of soapy water, the 197 catalysts in San Diego County would increase County water demand by approximately 22 gallons per day (7,880 gallons per year). Also, the small amount of grease and particles removed during each water soak will require minimal treatment prior to discharge.

Project implementation would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area; would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity for existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality; would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area; would not place structures which would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area; and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, death, inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, no impact to hydrology or water quality is expected.

APPENDIX G

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established <u>community</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would not physically divide an established community; would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; and would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on land use/planning.



APPENDIX G

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State; and would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on mineral resources.

APPENDIX G

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIII. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in <u>excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive <u>groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people <u>residing</u> or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Implementation of this project will not result in generation of substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels, and no ground-disturbing activities would be involved. Project implementation would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of applicable standards; would not expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise; would not result in a substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels; and would not affect any airport land use plan or private air strip. Based on this discussion it is expected that project implementation would not have an adverse noise impact.

**APPENDIX G**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would not induce substantial growth and would not displace substantial numbers of housing or people, requiring the construction of replacement housing. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on population/housing.

APPENDIX G

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, <u>in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</u>				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

There will be no physical impacts to governmental facilities, and no new or altered governmental facilities would be required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public services. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on public services

**APPENDIX G**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. RECREATION.</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would not result in increased use of any existing neighborhood park, regional park or recreation facility. The project does not include recreational facilities, nor does it require construction or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, it is expected that the project would have no adverse impact on recreational facilities.

**APPENDIX G**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION.</b> Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would not cause a substantial increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load; would not exceed the capacity of the street system; would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the regional congestion management agency for any road or highway; would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses; would not result in inadequate emergency access or parking capacity; and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would not have an adverse impact on transportation/traffic.

**APPENDIX G**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b>				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would not cause a change in tribal cultural resources that are listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, a local register of historical resources or a resource considered significant to a California Native American tribe. Based on this discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on tribal cultural resources.

**APPENDIX G**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, <u>dry</u> and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the <u>waste water</u> treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste <u>in excess</u> of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

No changes to the existing wastewater facilities are proposed as part of this project. Project implementation would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the regional water quality control board; would not require or result in the construction of new water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities; would not require water supplies in excess of existing entitlements and resources or require new or expanded entitlements; would not require additional wastewater treatment capacity or landfill; and would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on utilities/service systems.



**APPENDIX G**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XX. WILDFIRE.</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, <u>as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of Rule 67.26 will regulate approximately 197 existing facilities and require installation of control equipment within existing and new facilities meeting the applicability of the rule.

Project implementation would not impair an emergency response plan, exacerbate wildfire risks, require the installation of infrastructure nor expose people or structures to significant risks. Based on this discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on wildfires.

APPENDIX G

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the <u>number</u> or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Based on the analysis in this document, the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District finds that this project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project does not have cumulatively considerable impacts as demonstrated in the Air Quality section (III) of this document which evaluated the project's emissions. The project does not have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.