

## **INITIAL STUDY**

### **Ventura County Air Pollution Control District**

#### **Proposed Amendments to Rule 74.2, Architectural Coatings**

This initial study was prepared in accordance with the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines dated April 26, 2011, and the Ventura County Administrative Supplement to State CEQA guidelines dated July 13, 2010, which were prepared under the direction of the Ventura County Board of Supervisors. The Initial Study consists of five sections: Project Description, Initial Study Checklist, Discussion of Responses to Checklist, Mandatory Findings of Significance, and Determination of Environmental Document. The proposed amendments to Rule 74.2 will be posted on the Ventura County APCD website ([www.vcapcd.org](http://www.vcapcd.org)).

The Ventura County Administrative Supplement to State CEQA Guidelines, contains a provision that allows agencies or departments to reuse an EIR previously prepared and certified for one project, for another project if an Initial Study shows that the previous EIR adequately describes the current project's setting, impacts, alternatives and mitigation measures. A conclusion of this Initial Study is that the 2009 Final EIR certified for the 2010 amendments to Rule 74.2 adequately analyzes the same environmental issues that may result from the proposed 2017 amendments to Rule 74.2 and may be reused for CEQA purposes.

#### **Project Background Information**

**1. Project Title:**

*Proposed Amendments to Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) Rule 74.2, Architectural Coatings*

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

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District  
669 County Square Drive  
Ventura, CA 93003

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

Stan Cowen, Air Quality Engineer  
805/645-1408

**4. Project Location:**

These proposed amendments to Ventura County APCD Rule 74.2 affect architectural coatings that are specified, supplied, sold, or used in all areas of Ventura County.

**5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District  
669 County Square Drive  
Ventura, CA 93003

## **Section A - Project Description:**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the evaluation of the environmental impacts of proposed projects and the consideration of feasible methods to reduce, avoid, or eliminate identified significant adverse environmental impacts. In addition, this law requires that projects carried out by public agencies be subject to the same level of public review and consideration as private projects requiring approval by public agencies. To fulfill the purpose and intent of CEQA, the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD), as the lead agency, is distributing this initial study (IS) for proposed amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2, Architectural Coatings. The Initial Study identifies environmental issues that are the focus of a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This document also provides the rationale for excluding those topics that are not expected to have significant environmental impacts as a result of the adoption of amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2.

### **a) Objective of the Proposed Project**

The proposed amendments to Rule 74.2 are based on the current volatile organic compound (VOC) limits established by South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1113, Architectural Coatings. SCAQMD Rule 1113 sets allowable volatile organic compound (VOC) limits and other requirements (based on existing and currently developing coating technologies) for a number of architectural coating categories including: flats; nonflats; nonflat – high gloss; bituminous roof; concrete curing; dry fog; faux finish clear coats; fire proof; floor; form release; graphic arts; industrial maintenance; metallic pigmented; aluminum roof coatings; mastic texture; primers, sealers and undercoaters; rust preventative coatings; waterproofing sealers; exterior stain coatings; and zinc primers. All of the proposed new VOC limits would become effective on January 1, 2019. The revised Rule 74.2 would apply to any person who supplies, sells, offers for sale, or manufactures any architectural coating for use within the District, as well as any person who applies or solicits the application of any architectural coating within the District. Appendix A presents the proposed revisions to Rule 74.2 in strikeout/underline format. The proposed amendments to Rule 74.2 will be posted on the District's website at [www.vcapcd.org](http://www.vcapcd.org).

### **b) Background and Reason for the Project**

Ventura County exceeds the state and federal standards for ozone and the state standard for particulate matter. The object of the proposed amendments to Rule 74.2 is to reduce ROC emissions, which are a precursor to the formation of ozone. ROC emissions from architectural coatings originate from the organic solvent portion of the coating. Ozone is the product of a complex chain of chemical reactions which occur in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. The primary compounds in these chemical reactions are ROC and oxides of nitrogen. The Ventura County Air Pollution Control Board adopted the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan on February 14, 2017, which contains measures needed to meet the federal ambient air quality standards including Control Measure R-333-2017, Architectural Coatings. The estimated ROC emission reductions from the adoption of proposed amendments to Rule 74.2 are 0.4 tons per day. In addition, Ventura

County is required to meet the California Clean Air Act. Air districts such as Ventura County that are nonattainment for the state ozone standard are required by Health and Safety Code 40914 to adopt All Feasible Measures. The state guidelines for the determination of feasible measures require the review of rules successfully implemented in other air districts, such as SCAQMD.

**c) Summary of Environmental Impact Analysis**

When the SCAQMD adopted the 2016 Proposed Amended Rule 1113 on February 5, 2016, they adopted the corresponding Final Environmental Assessment (State Clearinghouse –SCH No. 2015091040). In addition, VCAPCD prepared and certified a Final EIR for the 2009/2010 Proposed amendments to Rule 74.2 (SCH No. 2001061106), which looked at the environmental impacts of that project including analysis of the following five potential impacts of the latest amendments: air quality; hazardous emissions and hazardous waste; and surface and ground water quality. VCAPCD staff concluded that there will be no significant adverse impacts from any of the aforementioned five potential impacts. In addition, staff determined that no adverse impacts of the following environmental resources will result from implementing the proposed amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2:

- Public Services
- Transportation/Circulation
- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Geophysical
- Biological Resources
- Energy and Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation

Because both the VCAPCD EIR for the 2009 Amendments to Rule 74.2 and the SCAQMD Final Environment Assessment for the 2016 Proposed Amendments to Rule 1113 thoroughly analyzed the same air quality impacts, VCAPCD, as the lead agency, has elected to reuse the 2009 EIR as the draft EIR for this project. This reuse is allowed under the Ventura County Supplement to state CEQA guidelines if the previous EIR adequately describes the current project's setting, impacts, alternatives and mitigation measures.

**6. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:**

No other agencies have discretionary authority over this project.

**7. Project Compatibility with Existing Zones and Plans:**

Adoption of this rule will not affect any land use zones or plans.

**8. Name of Person Who Prepared Initial Study:** Stan Cowen, Air Quality Engineer

**SECTION B**  
**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST\***  
**PROJECT NAME: Proposed Amendments to**  
**APCD Rule 74.2, Architectural Coatings**

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>ISSUE AREA</u>	<u>PROJECT IMPACT</u>				<u>CUMULATIVE IMPACT</u>			
		<u>DEGREE OF EFFECT**</u>				<u>DEGREE OF EFFECT**</u>			
		<u>N</u>	<u>LS</u>	<u>PS-M</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>LS</u>	<u>PS-M</u>	<u>PS</u>
<b>GENERAL:</b>	<b>1. <u>GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS AND POLICIES:</u></b>	X				X			
<b>LAND USE:</b>	<b>2. <u>LAND USE</u></b>								
	A. COMMUNITY CHARACTER:	X				X			
	B. HOUSING:	X				X			
	C. GROWTH INDUCEMENT:	X				X			
<b>RESOURCES:</b>	<b>3. <u>AIR QUALITY</u></b>								
	A. REGIONAL:				X				X
	B. LOCAL:				X				X
	C. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	X				X			
	<b>4. <u>WATER RESOURCES</u></b>								
	A. GROUND WATER QUANTITY:	X				X			
	B. GROUND WATER QUALITY:		X				X		
	C. SURFACE WATER QUANTITY:	X				X			
	D. SURFACE WATER QUALITY:		X				X		
	<b>5. <u>MINERAL RESOURCES</u></b>								
	A. AGGREGATE:	X				X			
	B. PETROLEUM:	X				X			
	<b>6. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u></b>								
	A. ENDANGERED, THREATENED, OR RARE SPECIES:	X				X			
	B. WETLAND HABITAT:	X				X			
	C. COASTAL HABITAT:	X				X			
	D. MIGRATION CORRIDORS:	X				X			
	E. LOCALLY IMPORTANT SPECIES/ COMMUNITIES:	X				X			
	<b>7. <u>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</u></b>								
	A. SOILS:	X				X			
	B. WATER:	X				X			
	C. AIR QUALITY/MICRO-CLIMATE:	X				X			
	D. PESTS/DISEASES:	X				X			
	E. LAND USE INCOMPATIBILITY:	X				X			
	<b>8. <u>VISUAL RESOURCES</u></b>								
	A. SCENIC HIGHWAY:	X				X			
	B. SCENIC AREA/FEATURE:	X				X			
	<b>9. <u>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</u></b>	X				X			
	<b>10. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u></b>								
	A. ARCHAEOLOGICAL:	X				X			
B. HISTORICAL:	X				X				

ISSUE	ISSUE AREA	PROJECT IMPACT				CUMULATIVE IMPACT			
		DEGREE OF EFFECT**				DEGREE OF EFFECT**			
		N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>RESOURCES:</b> <b>(CONT'D)</b>	C. ETHNIC, SOCIAL OR RELIGIOUS:	X				X			
	11. <b>ENERGY RESOURCES:</b>	X				X			
	12. <b>COASTAL BEACHES &amp; SAND DUNES:</b>	X				X			
<b>HAZARDS:</b>	<b>13. SEISMIC HAZARDS</b>								
	A. FAULT RUPTURE:	X				X			
	B. GROUND SHAKING:	X				X			
	C. TSUNAMI:	X				X			
	D. SEICHE:	X				X			
	E. LIQUEFACTION:	X				X			
	<b>14. GEOLOGIC HAZARDS</b>								
	A. SUBSIDENCE:	X				X			
	B. EXPANSIVE SOILS:	X				X			
	C. LANDSLIDES/MUDSLIDES:	X				X			
	<b>15. HYDRAULIC HAZARDS</b>								
	A. EROSION/SILTATION:	X				X			
	B. FLOODING:	X				X			
	<b>16. AVIATION HAZARDS:</b>	X				X			
	<b>17. FIRE HAZARDS:</b>	X				X			
	<b>18. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE</b>								
	A. HAZARDOUS EMISSIONS:		X				X		
	B. BELOW-GROUND HAZARDOUS MTLs.:	X				X			
	C. HAZARDOUS WASTE:		X				X		
	<b>19. NOISE AND VIBRATION:</b>	X				X			
	<b>20. GLARE:</b>	X				X			
<b>21. Public Health:</b>	X				X				
<b>PUBLIC FACILITIES/ SERVICES:</b>	<b>22. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION</b>								
	A. PUBLIC ROADS AND HIGHWAYS								
	(1) LEVEL OF SERVICE:	X				X			
	(2) SAFETY/DESIGN:	X				X			
	(3) TACTICAL ACCESS:	X				X			
	B. PRIVATE ROADS AND DRIVEWAYS								
	(1) SAFETY/DESIGN:	X				X			
	(2) TACTICAL ACCESS:	X				X			
	C. PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE								
	(1) PUBLIC FACILITIES:	X				X			
	(2) PRIVATE FACILITIES:	X				X			
	D. PARKING:	X				X			
	E. BUS TRANSIT:	X				X			
	F. RAILROADS:	X				X			
	G. AIRPORTS:	X				X			
	H. HARBORS:	X				X			
	I. PIPELINES:	X				X			

ISSUE	ISSUE AREA	PROJECT IMPACT				CUMULATIVE IMPACT			
		DEGREE OF EFFECT**				DEGREE OF EFFECT**			
		N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
	<b>23. HYDROLOGY AND WATER SUPPLY</b>								
<b>PUBLIC FACILITIES SERVICES: (CONT'D)</b>	A. QUALITY:	X				X			
	B. QUANTITY:	X				X			
	C. FIRE FLOW:	X				X			
	<b>24. WASTE TREATMENT/DISPOSAL</b>								
	A. INDIVIDUAL SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM:	X				X			
	B. SEWAGE COLLECTION/TREATMENT FACILITIES:	X				X			
	C. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT:		X				X		
	D. SOLID WASTE FACILITIES:	X				X			
	<b>25. UTILITIES</b>								
	A. ELECTRIC:	X				X			
	B. GAS:	X				X			
	C. COMMUNICATION:	X				X			
	<b>26. FLOOD CONTROL/DRAINAGE</b>								
	A. FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT FACILITY:	X				X			
	B. OTHER FACILITIES:	X				X			
	<b>27. LAW ENFORCEMENT/EMERGENCY SVS</b>								
	A. PERSONNEL/EQUIPMENT:	X				X			
	B. FACILITIES:	X				X			
	<b>28. FIRE PROTECTION</b>								
	A. DISTANCE/RESPONSE TIME:	X				X			
	B. PERSONNEL/EQUIPMENT/FACILITIES:	X				X			
	<b>29. EDUCATION</b>								
	A. SCHOOLS:	X				X			
	B. LIBRARIES:	X				X			
	<b>30. RECREATION</b>								
	A. LOCAL PARKS/FACILITIES:	X				X			
	B. REGIONAL PARKS/FACILITIES:	X				X			
	C. REGIONAL TRAILS/CORRIDORS:	X				X			

\* Analyzing:

- a) changes resulting from amending APCD Rule 74.2
- b) changes with respect to circumstances
- c) new information

\*\* Explanation: Degree of Effect

- N = No Effect
- LS = Less Than Significant Effect
- PS-M = Potentially Significant-Impact Mitigated
- PS = Potentially Significant Impact

<b>D. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>		<b>YES/</b>	
<b>BASED ON THE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN SECTIONS B AND C:</b>		<b><u>MAYBE</u></b>	<b><u>NO</u></b>
1.	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, 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?		<b>X</b>
2.	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of the long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one that occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long term impacts will endure well into the future.)		<b>X</b>
3.	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 view in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effect of probable future projects. (Several projects may have relatively small individual impacts on two or more resources, but the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)		<b>X</b>
4.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		<b>NO</b>

<b>E. DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT</b>	
<b>ON THE BASIS OF THIS INITIAL EVALUATION:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration should 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 the mitigation measure(s) described in Section C of the Initial Study will be applied to the project. A Mitigated Negative Declaration should be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project, individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment and an Environmental Impact Report 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 analyses as described on attached sheets. An Environmental Impact Report is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment. Because all potentially significant effects have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, the earlier EIR will be reused as the draft EIR for this project.

Dated: 8-15-2017

VENTURA COUNTY  
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Air Pollution Control Officer

## SECTION C RESPONSES TO THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

### ISSUE

#### **1. General Plan Environmental Goals and Policies**

The provisions of the amendments to APCD Rule 74.2 are fully consistent with the goals and policies of the Ventura County General Plan to improve the environment of Ventura County.

#### **2. Land Use (a-c)**

APCD Rule 74.2 does not have any provisions that would impact community character, increase demand for housing, remove impediments to growth in the county, or result in a significant loss of agricultural land. There are no provisions in APCD Rule 74.2 that would affect land use plans, policies, or regulations. It is also expected that APCD Rule 74.2 will not affect infrastructure development or require changes to existing zone designations. Land use and other planning considerations are determined by local governments and no land use or planning requirements will be altered by APCD Rule 74.2. There are no provisions in APCD Rule 74.2 that would induce substantial population growth in an area, nor displace a substantial number of existing housing or people.

#### **3. Air Quality (a and b)**

According to Air Resources Board and VCAPCD staff, the proposed amendments to Rule 74.2 will improve air quality by reducing ROC emissions, which are ozone precursors. Based on the most recent ARB survey of architectural coatings sold in the state, the estimated ROC emission reductions in Ventura County would be 0.4 tons per day. However, previous comments from the paint manufacturing industry dispute the air quality benefits resulting previously adopted rule amendments, which are similar to those proposed at this time. These comments can be categorized into seven areas of potential concern. These are:

#### **The use of lower-ROC coatings will result in a thicker film coating.**

Industry comments have asserted that low-VOC coatings are formulated with high-solids contents that are difficult to apply without leaving a thick film on the substrate. A thicker film means that more paint is needed to cover a given surface area resulting in higher ROC emissions. Review of manufacturer's product data sheets of trade coatings shows currently available low-ROC coatings are mainly waterborne coatings that are not necessarily formulated with higher solids contents. Industrial maintenance coatings may have higher solids contents, but these coatings are normally applied by painting professionals using high performance spray equipment. Although high-solids, low-ROC coatings are being used, the recommended film thickness for these coatings is similar to that for higher-ROC coatings. Since these coatings are commonly applied with more than one coat to a specified mil thickness, the use of higher solids coatings will reduce the number of coats needed and result in less coating material applied and fewer ROC emissions.

**The use of lower-ROC coatings will result in excessive thinning of the coating.**

Increased ROC emissions from excessive thinning is not expected because many coatings, as applied, already comply with the new proposed ROC content limits. Additionally, most of the compliant coatings are waterborne, which may be only be thinned with water, which is not a pollutant. Since the coating ROC content limits in the proposed amendments are expressed in terms of the manufacturer's maximum thinning recommendation, then use of excessive thinning is prohibited by the rule.

**The use of lower-ROC coatings requires the use of additional primer for proper adhesion to the substrate.**

Manufacturer's product data sheets show that substrate preparation for lower-ROC coatings is similar to higher-ROC coatings. Lasting coating adhesion is more a function of proper surface preparation rather than the type of coating used. Lower-ROC coatings have performed well in tests for hardness, adhesion and resistance to stains, chemicals and corrosion without the need for additional priming.

**Lower-ROC coatings will require the use of more coats.**

Industry representatives have claimed that more coats of lower-ROC coatings will be required to achieve adequate coverage. High quality coatings made for durability and coverage may be manufactured in low-ROC formulations. It is the quality of the resins and pigments that determine hiding, not whether it is solvent or water-based. Product data sheets provided by the manufacturer listing coverage rates do not indicate that lower-ROC architectural coatings provide less coverage than higher-ROC coatings. Given high quality coatings, lower-ROC and higher-ROC coatings have comparable coverage and performance. Thus more coats will not be needed for the lower-ROC coatings.

**The use of lower-ROC coatings will require more frequent recoating, touch-up, and repair work.**

Technical data sheets on lower-ROC coatings indicate that durability characteristics similar to or better than higher-ROC coatings. Low-ROC architectural coatings have been used successfully for many years and are considered to be as durable and long lasting as higher-ROC coatings. Therefore, the need for recoats, touch-up, and repair work on lower-ROC coating jobs is not expected.

**The use of lower-ROC coatings will result in product substitution by end-users.**

There are currently available low-ROC architectural coatings with performance characteristics comparable to higher-ROC architectural coatings. As a result, end-users do not need to substitute products from a higher-ROC coating category. VCAPCD Rule 74.2 prohibits the application of certain coatings in specific settings, and performance requirements for certain jobs, such as in an industrial maintenance setting, would discourage users from substituting coatings

that would not perform as well. The coating characteristics of products within a given architectural coating category may differ from those of another category making the ability to successfully substitute products difficult and less likely. VCAPCD Rule 74.2 requires that when a coating can be used in more than one coating category, the lower limit of the two categories is applicable.

#### **The use of lower-ROC coatings may result in the use of coatings with higher reactivity.**

APCD and ARB staffs agree that some components in higher-ROC coatings, such as mineral spirits, may have a lower reactivity than some components in lower-ROC coatings, such as propylene glycol. However, the impact on ozone formation and air quality depends on the both weighted overall reactivity of all the components in a coating and the actual mass percentage of ROC in the coating. Higher-ROC coatings have a blend of organic solvents, some with low reactivity, but several solvents, such as toluene, xylene, and ethylene glycol ether, which have MIR values ranging from 3.78 to 7.45, which is two to three times higher than the MIR for propylene glycol. Therefore, the weighted reactivity of a higher-ROC coating may be higher than the reactivity of a lower-ROC coating.

Typically, waterborne coatings that are required to meet a Regulatory ROC limit have much fewer ROC emissions because the ROC content is calculated by subtracting the water from both the volatiles and the coating volume. For example a waterborne coating meeting a regulatory ROC limit of 350 grams per liter may have no more than 120 grams of ROC content to be compliant. Therefore, the much lower actual mass of ROC content in lower-ROC waterborne coatings compared to higher-ROC content coatings overwhelms any potential lower reactivity in higher-ROC coatings. In the SCM, ARB staff concluded that the total reactivity of the lower-ROC architectural coatings will be less than the reactivity of the higher-ROC architectural coatings.

#### **4. Water Resources (b and d)**

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) are responsible for protecting surface and groundwater supplies in Ventura County, regulating waste disposal, and requiring cleanup of hazardous conditions. In particular, the SWRCB establishes water-related policies and approves water quality control plans, which are implemented and enforced by the LARWQCB. These agencies also regulate discharges to State waters through federal National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. Discharges to publicly owned treatment works (POTW) are regulated through federal pretreatment requirements enforced by the POTWs.

The SCM and proposed amendments to Rule 74.2 are not expected to adversely impact water quality since the use of less toxic exempt solvents is expected to result in equivalent or less water quality impacts than currently used solvents. Water resources impacts are considered significant if they cause changes in the course of water movements or of drainage or surface runoff patterns; substantially degrade water quality; deplete water resources; significantly increase toxic inflow to public waste water treatment facilities; or interfere with groundwater recharge efforts. Since no

significant adverse impacts are anticipated, no mitigation measures are necessary.

The EIR performed in 2009 indicated that the increased water demand associated with the implementation of the SCM is de minimus. Adopting the 2017 amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2 is also not expected to adversely impact water quality because the use of exempt solvents is expected to result in equivalent or lesser water quality impacts than currently used solvents because the exempt solvents are less toxic. Further, because currently available compliant coatings are already based on waterborne technology, no additional water quality impacts from these coatings are expected. Finally, adopting the 2017 amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2 will not promote the use of compliant coatings that are formulated with hazardous solvents that could impact water quality.

**5. Mineral Resources (a-b)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 is not expected to adversely impact mineral resources because it will neither limit access to, nor increase demand for, such materials. There are no provisions in VCAPCD Rule 74.2 that would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources or a locally important mineral resource recovery site that would be of value to the region and residents of the county.

**6. Biological Resources (a-e)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would impact biological resources. The adoption of VCAPCD Rule 74.2 is not expected to adversely affect existing plant or animal species or communities, unique or endangered plant or animal species, or agricultural crops. Further, improvements in Ventura County's air quality expected from VCAPCD Rule 74.2 are expected to provide health benefits to plant and animal species.

**7. Agricultural Resources (a-e)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would adversely impact agricultural resources. Because many agricultural crops are sensitive to air pollution, VCAPCD Rule 74.2 should benefit agricultural resources in Ventura County by improving regional air quality.

**8. Visual Resources (a-b)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would adversely impact visual resources. The adoption of VCAPCD Rule 74.2 will not affect aesthetics. The reduction of ROC emissions from the new rule requirements will reduce ambient ozone that may cause corrosion on historic buildings synergistically with other pollutants.

**9. Paleontological Resources**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would adversely impact paleontological resources.

**10. Cultural Resources (a-c)**

There will be no impact on any cultural or historic resources from the adoption of VCAPCD Rule 74.2. Further, improvements in air quality from VCAPCD Rule 74.2 are expected to lessen the damage to historic sites from the effects of ozone pollution.

**11. Energy Resources**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provisions that would adversely impact energy resources.

**12. Coastal Beaches and Sand Dunes**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provisions that would adversely impact coastal beaches or sand dunes.

**13. Seismic Hazards (a-e)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provisions that would result in seismic hazard impacts.

**14. Geologic Hazards (a-c)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provisions that would result in geologic hazard impacts.

**15. Hydraulic Hazards (a-b)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would result in hydraulic hazard impacts.

**16. Aviation Hazards**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would increase aviation hazards.

**17. Fire Hazards**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would increase the potential for fire hazards. The proposed amendments will encourage the use of waterborne coatings in place of much more flammable solvent-based coatings.

## **18. Hazardous Emissions/Waste Disposal (a and c)**

According to the rule staff report, future compliant coatings will contain less hazardous materials compared to solvent-based coatings, resulting in lower hazardous emissions. The human health impact performed in the staff report examined the potential increased long-term (carcinogenic and chronic) and short term (acute) human health impacts associated with the use of various replacement solvents in compliant coating formulations. It was concluded that the general public and coating applicators would not be exposed to either long-term or short-term health risks from adopting the 2017 proposed amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2.

The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) is the lead agency in California for hazardous waste management. DTSC enforces California's hazardous waste control laws, issues permits to hazardous waste facilities, and mitigates contaminated hazardous waste sites. In California, leftover liquid waterborne and solvent-based coatings are considered a hazardous waste and must be disposed of with a facility that is registered with DTSC.

After collection at household hazardous waste collection sites, waterborne coatings may be consolidated for reuse. Reuse of waterborne coatings that are in good condition may effectively reduce the volume of coating disposal by 50 percent or more. Post-consumer paints can also be reprocessed as high quality recycled paints. Some communities use this consolidated waterborne coatings in anti-graffiti campaigns. Because waterborne paint is not considered a household hazardous waste when dried, small quantities may be disposed in municipal solid waste landfills.

Solvent-based coatings are generally not good candidates for reuse because of the complexity and incompatibility of the formulations. Cement kilns can use waste solvent-based paints as a fuel source provided they have a sufficient BTU value. If the collected solvent-based coatings do not quality as a fuel, they must be disposed of as a hazardous waste through a licensed contractor. The use of solvent-based coatings require the use of cleaning solvents, such as mineral spirits, paint thinner or turpentine, for cleanup and thinning. This may generate additional hazardous waste for disposal. In addition, these cleaning solvents are highly flammable, which may create a fire hazard if they are stored or used improperly.

The solid waste/hazardous waste analysis performed in the staff report examined the increased disposal of compliant coatings due to the possibility of shorter shelf life or pot lives or lesser freeze/thaw capabilities. Adverse solid waste/hazardous waste impacts associated with these potential characteristics are expected to be less than significant. Moreover, the proposed amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2 includes a three year sell-through provision that allows coatings that are manufactured prior to the new effective date of the new ROC coating limit to be sold and used for up to three years after that date. In this way, VCAPCD Rule 74.2 will not create hazardous waste from existing non-compliant coatings.

## **19. Noise and Vibration:**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provisions that would cause noise or vibration.

**20. Glare:**

APCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would increase glare.

**21. Public Health**

Proposed amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2 are designed to protect public health by reducing emissions of reactive organic compounds, a precursor to ambient ozone formation.

**22. Transportation and Circulation (a-i)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provisions that would adversely impact roads, vehicles, trains, buses, or other transportation-related entities.

**23. Water Supply (a):**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provisions that would adversely impact water supply.

**24. Waste Treatment/Disposal (a-c)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would adversely impact waste treatment/disposal facilities. Existing state and local regulations governing waste treatment and disposal will ensure that there are no significant impacts.

**25. Utilities (a-c)**

There are no provisions in the proposed amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2 that would affect existing communication systems, sewer or septic tanks, regional water treatment or distribution facilities, or any other utilities.

**26. Flood Control/Drainage (a-b)**

APCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would adversely impact flood control or drainage facilities.

**27. Law Enforcement/Emergency Services (a-b)**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would adversely impact law enforcement or emergency services.

**28. Fire Protection (a-b):**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would adversely impact fire protection impacts.

**29. Education (a-b):**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would adversely impact education.

**30. Recreation (a-c):**

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not include any provision that would adversely impact on recreation or recreation facilities.

**Section D. Discussion of Mandatory Findings of Significance (1-4)**

There are no provisions in VCAPCD Rule 74.2 that would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, or impact in any manner any rare or endangered plant or animal. Nor would this rule impact or eliminate any important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

VCAPCD Rule 74.2 does not have the potential to achieve short term, to the disadvantage of long-term goals. This project also does not have impacts which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.

Because the analysis of the potentially significant impacts on air quality discussed in Section 3 (Air Quality) is very similar to the analysis in the 2009 EIR for the adoption of the 2010 amendments to VCAPCD Rule 74.2, it is proposed to reuse the 2009 EIR as the draft EIR for this project.