



**Monterey Bay Air Resources District**  
24580 Silver Cloud Court, Monterey, CA 93940

## **Public Notice – Proposed Negative Declaration Notice of Intent to Adopt Negative Declaration**

**Project Title:** Proposed Revisions to Monterey Bay Air Resources District Rule 426

**Project Location:** The North Central Coast Air Basin comprised of Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito counties.

**Project Description:** The Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) is proposing to revise Rule 426 Architectural Coatings. These revisions are proposed to implement the Suggested Control Measure approved by the California Air Resources Board on May 23, 2019 and May 28, 2020.

**Project Sponsor and Lead Agency:**  
Monterey Bay Air Resources District  
24580 Silver Cloud Court, Monterey, CA 93940

**Proposed Environmental Finding:** Based on the Initial Study prepared for the proposed Project, the Monterey Bay Air Resources District finds that the proposed Project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

**Public Review Period:**  
**July 24, 2020 through August 24, 2020**

Copies of the Proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study are available for review at the MBARD office at the address above or can be downloaded at: [www.mbard.org](http://www.mbard.org).

**Public Meetings/Hearings:**

**Public Workshop**  
**August 12, 2020; 1:30PM**  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84812275329>

**Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**September 4, 2020; 1:30PM**  
MBARD Advisory Committee  
24580 Silver Cloud Court  
Monterey, CA 93940  
This meeting will likely be conducted remotely using ZOOM. Please check [mbard.org](http://mbard.org) for the meeting link.

**Board Adoption Hearing**  
**September 16, 2020; 1:30PM**  
MBARD Board of Directors  
24580 Silver Cloud Court  
Monterey, CA 93940  
This meeting will likely be conducted remotely using ZOOM. Please check [mbard.org](http://mbard.org) for the meeting link.

## INITIAL STUDY

<b>Project title:</b>	Proposed Revisions to Rule 426
<b>Lead agency name and address:</b>	Monterey Bay Air Resources District, 24580 Silver Cloud Court, Monterey, CA 93940
<b>Contact person and phone number:</b>	Amy Clymo, Engineering and Compliance Manager <a href="mailto:aclymo@mbard.org">aclymo@mbard.org</a> , (831)718-8013
<b>Project Location:</b>	North Central Coast Air Basin comprised of Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito counties

### Project Description

The Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) is proposing to revise Rule 426 Architectural Coatings. These revisions are proposed to implement the Suggested Control Measures (SCM) approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) on May 23, 2019 and May 28, 2020. An SCM is not a formal regulation. It is a model rule that can be adopted by the local air district to reduce volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions to improve air quality. The SCM sets VOC limits for different categories of Architectural Coatings in units of grams per liter (g/l). On May 23, 2019, CARB updated the SCM for Architectural Coatings and estimated the May 2019 SCM (2019 SCM) would reduce VOC emissions in MBARD's jurisdiction by 0.09 tons per day (tpd).

More recently, CARB updated the SCM in May 2020 (2020 SCM), which established a new category, Photovoltaic Coatings, with a VOC limit of 600 g/l. A Photovoltaic Coating is applied to solar photovoltaic modules already installed and manufactured without an anti-reflective coating. Application of Photovoltaic Coatings to installed solar modules is a new process to improve solar panel efficiency. CARB estimated that within MBARD's jurisdiction, Photovoltaic Coatings may be used on solar modules at one facility capable of generating 169 megawatts (MW) of electricity. The rule will limit the use of this coating to 27 gallons per day with a sunset date for use of January 1, 2028. The use of Photovoltaic Coatings on 169 MW of solar modules could result in an increase of VOC emissions by 0.068 tpd. Overall, with implementation of the 2019 SCM and 2020 SCM into Rule 426, MBARD anticipates a net decrease of 0.022 tpd of VOC emissions.

### Environmental Setting

The proposed Project is located in the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB) comprised of Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito counties. The NCCAB is designated as attainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and is designated as a nonattainment area for the state ozone and respirable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) standards. In December 2019, the NCCAB was designated for the second year in a row as nonattainment-transitional meaning that there were fewer than three exceedances of the state ozone standard at one monitor. The NCCAB is nearing attainment of the state ozone standard. The state PM<sub>10</sub> standard was exceeded at the King City and Hollister monitors in the later part of 2019. This was an improvement from previous years when the PM<sub>10</sub> standard is typically exceeded starting in May through November. The main contributor to the ozone exceedances is

pollution transport from the Bay Area while the main contributor to PM<sub>10</sub> exceedances is fugitive dust from sources such as agricultural field operations or windblown dust.

### California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

MBARD finds that the proposed Rule 426 revisions and rule additions are defined as a “project” under CEQA and thus required MBARD to undertake the environmental review process (PRC §21000 et seq.). A typical first step is to prepare an “initial study” that examines numerous environmental areas (see Appendix G: Environmental Checklist Form of the State CEQA Guidelines). The intent of the CEQA process is to inform MBARD’s governing Board, other public agencies, and interested parties of possible adverse environmental impacts (directly or indirectly) that could result from implementing the revisions to Rule 426 prior to approval.

MBARD, acting as the lead agency, has prepared this initial study/negative declaration pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines (§15063 and §15070). The purpose of an initial study is to provide information to be used as the basis for deciding whether to prepare a negative declaration or an environmental impact report and provide the factual basis supporting that decision. An “environmental checklist” has been included that was used to determine if the proposed Project may have potential adverse effects on the environment. Using the environmental checklist, MBARD finds that the proposed Project will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore, proposes to adopt a Negative Declaration.

### Background

MBARD previously updated Rule 426 in 2012 to incorporate CARB’s SCM for architectural coatings. The current revisions are to incorporate the 2019 SCM and 2020 SCM revisions. The 2020 SCM revisions are of particular importance due to the existence of a solar project within MBARD’s jurisdiction which may utilize the Photovoltaic Coating on existing panels. The rule revisions will include a sunset date for the Photovoltaic Coating category of January 1, 2028. Overall, the Rule 426 revisions are anticipated to reduce VOC emissions. The following checklist summarizes the environmental factors evaluated which were determined to have a less than significant or no impact on the environment.

At this time, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all meetings will be conducted remotely using the online meeting platform Zoom. The Advisory Committee and Board meeting Zoom links will be available at [www.mbard.org](http://www.mbard.org) one week before the meeting date.

### **Summary of Public Workshops and Public Hearings**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date/Time</b>	<b>Where</b>
Public Workshop	August 12, 2020; 1:30PM	Zoom meeting link: <a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84812275329">https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84812275329</a>
Advisory Committee	September 3, 2020; 1:30PM	This meeting will likely be conducted remotely using ZOOM. Please check <a href="http://mbard.org">mbard.org</a> for the meeting link.
Board of Directors Adoption Hearing	September 16, 2020; 1:30PM	

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. The following checklist discusses potential impacts for air quality and provides the rationale for assessing no impact for the remaining resource areas.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<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/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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 <b>MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an <b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT</b> is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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 <b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT</b> is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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 <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> , including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required

<b>Signature:</b> 	<b>Date: 7/22/2020</b>
<b>Printed Name: Amy Clymo, Engineering and Compliance Manager</b>	

### Environmental Review Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS:</b> 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) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<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"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of lighting. The proposed rule revisions have no potential to affect scenic vistas, substantially degrade the existing visual quality of any site and its surroundings, or create new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views of an area. Based upon the above considerations, no significant adverse aesthetic impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				

<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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 Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board.</p> <p>There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that are applicable to agricultural or forest resources. The proposed rule revisions have no potential to convert farmland to non-agricultural uses, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or other changes that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses because the rules have no authority over land use activities. Based upon the above considerations, no significant adverse agriculture and forest resources impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with 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 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) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Air Quality Discussion**

MBARD is proposing revisions to Rule 426 Architectural Coatings based on two updated Suggested Control Measures (SCM) from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) approved in 2019 and 2020.

**Responses to Questions a and b**

The proposed Rule 426 changes would have no impact on conflicting with implementation of the applicable air quality plan or violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

MBARD is currently designated attainment for the federal ozone standard and nonattainment-transitional for the state ozone standard. MBARD's 2007 Federal Maintenance Plan documents maintenance of the 1997 federal ozone standard. MBARD was designated as attainment for the federal 2008 ozone standard so additional planning documentation has been not required since approval of the 2007 plan. Therefore, the proposed changes would have no impact on the applicable federal air quality plan. MBARD is also subject to State ambient air quality standards and is designated as nonattainment-transitional for the 8-hour ozone. The proposed Rule 426 changes would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of MBARD's 2012 Triennial Plan for addressing the state ozone standard.

The revisions to Rule 426 will reduce VOC emissions from architectural coatings and VOC emissions are one of the precursor compounds to ozone formation. Implementation of the Rule 426 revisions would not increase emissions for other criteria pollutants such as carbon monoxide, particulate matter, oxides of nitrogen, or oxides of sulfur. Therefore, there would be no impact from implementation the Rule 426 revisions on air quality standards or substantial contribution of an existing or projected violation.

**Response to Question c**

MBARD is proposing revisions to Rule 426 Architectural Coatings based on two updated SCM adopted by CARB in 2019 and 2020. An SCM is not a formal regulation; rather it is a model rule that can be adopted by the local air district to reduce volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions to improve air quality. The SCM sets VOC limits for different categories of Architectural Coatings in units of grams per liter (g/l). On May 23, 2019, CARB updated the SCM for Architectural Coatings and estimated the impacts from the May 2019 SCM (2019 SCM) would reduce VOC emissions in MBARD’s jurisdiction by 0.09 tons per day (tpd).

More recently, CARB updated the SCM in May 2020 (2020 SCM), which established a new category, Photovoltaic Coatings, with a VOC limit of 600 g/l. A Photovoltaic Coating is applied to solar photovoltaic modules already installed and manufactured without an anti-reflective coating. Application of Photovoltaic Coatings to installed solar modules is a new process to improve solar panel efficiency. CARB estimated that within MBARD’s jurisdiction, Photovoltaic Coatings may be used at one facility with solar modules generating 169 megawatts (MW) of electricity. Rule 426 will limit the use of this coating to 27 gallons per day and have a sunset date of January 1, 2028. The use of Photovoltaic Coatings on the 169 MW of solar modules will result in an increase of VOC emissions by 0.068 tpd. Overall, with implementation of the 2019 SCM and 2020 SCM into Rule 426, MBARD anticipates a net decrease of 0.022 tpd of VOC emissions.

As shown in Table 1, the Rule 426 revisions are expected to result in a net decrease in VOC emissions. In addition, CARB anticipates the improved solar panel efficiency will result in avoidance of power plant emissions as shown in Table 2. Therefore, the cumulative air quality impact of the Rule 426 revisions would be less than significant.

**Table 1. Estimated Emissions from Rule 426**

Category	VOC (lbs/day)	NOx (lbs/day)	PM10 (lbs/day)	PM2.5 (lbs/day)	CO (lbs/day)
2019 SCM	-180	0	0	0	0
2020 SCM	+136	0	0	0	0
Net Change	-44	0	0	0	0
MBARD Thresholds	137	137	82	82	550

**Table 2. Estimated Power Plant Emissions Avoided**

Fuel Type	VOC (Tons)	NO <sub>x</sub> (Tons)	PM10 (Tons)	PM2.5 (Tons)	CO (Tons)
CARB Energy Mix	1.7	10.2	2.8	2.2	18.6

Responses to Questions d and e

The majority of the Rule 426 revisions will include stricter emission limits on the coating categories. The proposed new Photovoltaic Coating category in Rule 426 will allow for a short-term increase in VOC emissions if the coating is used within MBARD's jurisdiction. The use of the Photovoltaic Coating will be limited to 27 gallons per day and the use will sunset on January 1, 2028. There is only one possible solar array where this coating could be used and it is located in a remote area of southeastern Monterey County. Therefore, MBARD does not anticipate impacts to sensitive receptors or odors from the use of the Photovoltaic Coating at a remotely located solar facility. The remaining revisions to Rule 426 will impose stricter limits on coating categories. Therefore, the impacts from the Rule 426 revisions to sensitive receptors and odors impacting a substantial number of people will be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have 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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (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"/>

The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that are applicable to biological resources or would impact biological resources. The proposed rule revisions have no potential to effect habitat or species identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service, interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting

biological resources, or conflict with provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan. Based upon the above considerations, no significant adverse biological resource impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §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) 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"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that are applicable cultural resources. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that would substantially change cultural resources. The proposed rule revisions have no potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resources or unique geological feature or disturb human remains. Based upon the above considerations, no significant cultural resource impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 as a result of the project, and potentially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial 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 waste water 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"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures. Thus, the proposed Project has no potential to expose people or structures to earthquake faults, ground-shaking, liquefaction, landslides, soil erosion, or loss of topsoil. The proposed Project would not expose people or property to other geological hazards or other natural hazards because the purpose of the proposed Project is to clarify permit exemptions. The proposed Project does not include or affect in any way septic tanks or alternative water disposal systems and does not generate any wastewater.</p> <p>Based upon the above considerations, no significant geology and soils impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				
<b>VII. 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). CARB regulates greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from large stationary sources and has implemented regulations to reduce GHG emissions from mobile sources. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures that would generate GHG emissions. The proposed changes to Rules 426 would not conflict with a plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>The newly added Photovoltaic Coating category, if used, will improve solar panel energy efficiency by about 3 percent, as estimated by coating manufacturer Pellucere Technologies, Inc. CARB provided MBARD with an estimate of the avoided power plant emissions from this increased solar panel efficiency over 10 years. The GHG emissions benefits from the Photovoltaic Coating are shown in the table below.</p>				

**Table 3. Estimated Power Plant GHG Emissions Avoided**

Fuel Type	CO <sub>2</sub> (Metric Tons)
CARB Energy Mix	24,836

MBARD's GHG threshold of 10,000 metric tons per year would not be exceeded through implementation of the Rule 426 revisions as Architectural Coatings do not emit greenhouse gas emissions. As shown in Table 2 above, if the Photovoltaic Coating is used within MBARD's jurisdiction, it would have the benefit of reducing 24,836 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> over the 10-year remaining life of the solar module. Therefore, the Rule 426 revisions would not increase GHG emissions above 10,000 metric tons per year and there would be no impact on the environment from GHG emissions.

Based upon the above considerations, no significant GHG emissions impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the Rule 426 revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. 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 Section 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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) 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"/>

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures. There are federal and state rules and regulations that facilities handling hazardous materials must comply with which serve to minimize the potential impacts associated with hazards at these facilities. The proposed rule revisions do not involve the use, handling, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, there would be no impact to land near airports, emergency response plans, or public exposure to risk from wildland fires.</p> <p>Based upon the above considerations, no hazard or hazardous materials impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:</b> Would the project:	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<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, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures, construction of water facilities, or alteration of drainage patterns. Therefore, there would be no impact to water quality standards or water discharge requirements.</p> <p>Based upon the above considerations, no hydrology or water quality impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</b> Would the project:	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures. Land uses are generally regulated by city and/or county general plans through land use and zoning requirements. Therefore, there would be no impact to land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, or habitat conservation plans, or natural community conservation plans.</p> <p>Based upon the above considerations, no land use and planning impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				
<b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:</b> Would the project:				
a) 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?	<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,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

specific plan or other land use plan?				
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures. Therefore, there would be no loss in the availability of a known mineral source that would be of value to the region or availability of locally-important mineral recovery site delineated on any local plan.</p> <p>Based upon the above considerations, no mineral resource impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				
<b>XII. NOISE:</b> Would the project result in:	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures. Implementing the rule revisions would not generate noise levels above the existing condition.</p> <p>Noise issues are typically addressed in local General Plan policies and local noise ordinance standards. The noise ordinances may establish allowable noise limits or time restrictions within different land uses including residential areas, other sensitive use areas (e.g., schools, churches, hospitals, and libraries), commercial areas, and industrial areas.</p> <p>Based upon the above considerations, no noise impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial 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 housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD’s Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. Population and housing growth projections for the region were recently adopted by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) are generally regulated by city and/or county general plans through land use and zoning requirements. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures, or any other population growth inducing activities.</p> <p>Based upon the above considerations, no impacts to population or housing are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				
<b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:</b>				
a) Would the project 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, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD’s Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. MBARD covers three counties so public services are provided by a wide variety of local agencies. Fire protection and police protection/law enforcement services within the MBARD are provided by various districts, organizations, and agencies. There are several school districts, private schools, and park departments within MBARD’s jurisdiction. Public facilities are managed by different county, city, and special-use districts.</p>				

City and/or county general plans usually contain goals and policies to assure adequate public services are maintained within the local jurisdiction.

There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures. The proposed rule revisions would not induce or redistribute population growth and therefore would not increase demand on local fire or police services, schools, parks or other public facilities.

Based upon the above considerations, no impacts to public services are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

<b>XV. RECREATION:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</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"/>

The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. Recreational areas are generally maintained and regulated by city and/or county general plans at the local level through land use and zoning requirements. Some parks and recreation areas are designated and protected by state and federal regulations. The proposed rule revisions would not alter these designations. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures. As stated above, the proposed Project would not have population growth inducing impacts so the proposed rule revisions would not increase the use of, or demand for existing neighborhood and/or regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Based upon the above considerations, no recreation impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:</b> Would the project:	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a 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"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. AMBAG is the transportation planning, coordinating, and financing agency for the three county region supported by Regional Transportation Agencies in each county. These agencies regularly update the Metropolitan Transportation Plan which is the long-range transportation plan for the Monterey Bay region.

The rule revisions do not include any aspects that would conflict transportation planning. There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures, roadways that would increase hazards, result in inadequate emergency access or conflict with plans regarding transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

Based upon the above considerations, no transportation/traffic impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:</b> Would the project:	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater 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"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. MBARD covers three counties so utility and service systems are provided by a wide variety of local agencies. City and/or county general plans usually contain goals and policies to assure adequate utilities and service systems are maintained within the local jurisdictions.</p> <p>There are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures. The proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Implementation of the rule revisions would not result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements, require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or require new sources of water be developed. The proposed Project has no provisions that generate solid or hazardous waste, require additional waste disposal capacity, or generate waste that does not meet applicable federal, state, or local regulations.</p> <p>Based upon the above considerations, no utility and service system impacts are expected to occur due to implementation of the rule revisions, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.</p>				
<b>VIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Does the project 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, substantially 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?	<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"/>

The proposed Project is intended to update MBARD's Rule 426 Architectural Coatings to incorporate the volatile organic compound limits established by the California Air Resources Board. MBARD anticipates there would be little to no change from the existing condition with implementation of the rule revisions. The rule changes may have the added benefit of avoiding power plant emissions if the Photovoltaic Coating is used on the one existing solar facility where this coating could be used. In addition, there are no provisions under the proposed rule revisions that require the construction or modification of any buildings or structures, alteration or addition of existing structures.

There are also no provisions under the proposed Project that would affect land use plans, policies, or regulations. Land use and other planning considerations are determined by local governments and no land use or planning requirements will be altered by the proposed rule revisions. The proposed Project would not cause adverse effects that would degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat or fish or wildlife species, threaten a plant or animal community, or eliminate examples of California history or prehistory or in any way have an environmental effect that would cause adverse effects on human beings.