## CITY MANAGER'S REPORT <br> NOVEMBER 13, 2023 CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

## ITEM:

CONTINUED DISCUSSION FROM OCTOBER 9, 2023 REGULAR MEETING REGARDING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP-23-08 AND SITE PLAN REVIEW NO. SPR-23-09 FOR THE ASHLEY FURNITURE PROJECT

## RECOMMENDATION: Council to Consider the Following:

\author{

1. Testimony Presented During the Public Hearing Held October 9, 2023;
}
2. Adopt a Resolution to Find the Project Exempt from Further Environmental Review Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183; and
3. Adopt a Resolution to Approve a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review for the Ashley Furniture Project to Allow for the Construction of an Approximately $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ Million Square Foot Concrete Tilt-Up Building Located within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Area.

## SUMMARY:

The applicant, Hodgdon Group Realty, Inc., is requesting a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review to allow for the development of a $1,486,607 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. concrete tiltup building on an 89.82-acre property located at the northwest corner of Dos Reis Road and Manthey Road and within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 area. The proposed building will include a 24,000 sq. ft. office, a 110,260 sq. ft. retail outlet and showroom and a $1,352,347 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. warehouse distribution center.

The project includes related on- and off-site improvements, including but not limited to off-street parking, lighting, landscaping, solid wall and wrought iron fencing, outdoor employee break area, paving, and street improvements (landscaping, curb, gutter, and sidewalk).

The Planning Commission and staff recommend that City Council consider all information provided and submitted, take and consider all public testimony and, if determined to be appropriate, adopt a Resolution to find the project exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 and adopt a Resolution to approve the Conditional Use Permit (CUP-23-08) and Site Plan Review (SPR-23-09) for the Ashley Furniture Project.
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## SITE DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located at the northwest corner of Dos Reis Road and Manthey Road, north of terminus of Golden Valley Parkway at Dos Reis Road. The property address is 14101 S. Manthey Road and has an Accessor Parcel Number (APN) of 192-$020-14$ ). The project site is 89.82 -acres in size and is generally flat and historically been used for agricultural purposes. The site has been planned for urban development and is within the CLSP Phase 2 area. Planned infrastructure extensions will be constructed to the site for public water, sewer and stormwater. The City's General Plan designates the project site for Light Industrial (LI) land uses, and will be zoned IL-CL, Limited Industrial. The project site is bounded by agricultural properties to the north, Manthey Road and Interstate 5 (I-5) to the east, Dos Reis Road and ranchette properties to the south and agricultural properties to the west. The table below depicts the surrounding land uses of the project site:

|  | Land Use | Zoning District | General Plan (GP) Designation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | Agricultural Properties, City of Lathrop pond | IL-CL, Limited Industrial | LI-CL, Limited Industrial |
| South | Vacant Properties and Ranchette Properties Dos Reis Road | $\mathrm{CO} / \mathrm{DS}-\mathrm{CL},$ <br> Commercial Office R/MU/DS-CL, Residential/Mixed Use | OC-CL, Office Commercial, and R/MUCL, Residential Mixed Use |
| East | Manthey Road and Interstate 5 | CC, Central Commercial, R-1-5 One Family Residential R-1-5, R One Family Residential (across I-5 Highway) | CC, Central commercial and LD, Low Density Residential (across I-5 Highway) |
| West | Agricultural Properties | IL-CL, Limited Industrial | LI-CL, Limited Industrial |

Location Map:


## BACKGROUND:

The existing Ashley Furniture Outlet and Distribution Warehouse facility is located within the Crossroads Industrial area at 18290 S. Harlan Road (APN: 198-130-39), just north of the Home Depot Distribution Center. The 525,000 sq. ft. sq. ft. concrete tilt-up building was constructed in 2018 and includes a 50,000 sq. ft. retail outlet and distribution warehouse.

The Ashley Furniture Outlet and Warehouse serves as an Ashley Homestore and Outlet and distribution center. The facility will serve Northern California and adjacent States with regional offices and a call center. The applicant informed staff that Ashley Furniture's business operation has outgrown its existing facility on S. Harlan Road, and it is expected that the facility will be unable to accommodate the future operations anticipated for the company. As such, the proposed project will support the expansion needs of the company. Upon completion of the proposed project and relocation of the company to the new site, it is anticipated that subject to market conditions, the S. Harlan Road site will be completely vacated and listed for lease or sale.
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The proposed project is located within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) Phase 2 area. The CLSP was approved by the City Council on November 9, 2004. The project included certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH\# 2003072132), for the CLSP, adoption of the Specific Plan document, General Plan Land Use Map amendments, Zoning Map, and text amendments to the Lathrop Municipal Code (LMC). The CLSP is separated into two (2) major phases of development. Phase 1 is generally located south of Dos Reis Road and includes a High School, development of a regional park (adjacent to the High School), residential and commercial uses. Phase 2 is located north of Dos Reis Road and previously included development of residential and commercial uses, parks, and school sites (K$8)$.

The Lathrop General Plan Update in 2022 (adopted by City Council on September 19, 2022) modified the Phase 2 area (north of Dos Reis Road to the City limit boundary) of the CLSP from Residential and Commercial Land Use Designations to Limited Industrial. As a result of the newly adopted General Plan, the City is also initiating an update to the Lathrop Municipal Code and Zoning Map to bring both into consistency with the General Plan. An Amendment to the CLSP for Phase 2 is being processed by the City concurrently with the proposed Ashley Furniture Project. The Amendment would update the Specific Plan to provide development standards and design guidelines for the development of limited industrial uses to be consistent with the intent of the recently assigned Limited Industrial General Plan Land Use Designation. As such, all aspects of the proposed project have been reviewed in relationship to the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 design criteria illustrated in Chapter 7, "Design Guidelines" of the Specific Plan Amendment.

## PLANNING COMMISSION:

On September 13, 2023, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP-23-08) and Site Plan Review (SPR-23-09) for the Ashley Furniture Project. The Planning Commission received written correspondence from Mr. Michael R. Lozeau of Lozeau Drury, LLP, representing the Laborers' Union of North America, Local Union No. 73 (LIUNA) regarding the Ashley Furniture Project. The comment letter incorrectly asserts that additional CEQA analysis must be completed for the project.

With respect to the use of the exemption provisions provided under Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has applied these correctly to this project. Public Resources Code Section 20183.3 and corresponding State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 allows a streamlined environmental review process for projects that are consistent with the densities established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.
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The Ashley Warehouse project is consistent with the uses and development intensities established for the site under the City's General Plan and Land Use Map.

As such, the application of CEQA to the approval of development projects, such as the proposed Ashley Project, shall be limited to effects on the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the Project and which were not addressed as significant effects in the prior environmental impact report, or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the prior environmental impact report. (Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3.) Further, an effect of a project on the environment is not considered peculiar to the parcel or the project, if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been adopted by the local agency with a finding that they will substantially mitigate that effect when applied to future projects. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15183(f).)

The lead agency must make a finding at a public hearing that any mitigation measures in the prior EIR that apply to the project's specific effects, and that the lead agency found to be feasible, will be undertaken. (Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3(c); State CEQA Guidelines § 15183(e).) The City has done that here, by incorporating relevant policies, actions, standards, and other mitigating requirements as Conditions of Approval for the Ashley Warehouse project. These requirements and standards are specifically identified throughout the Environmental Analysis the City prepared for the Ashley Warehouse project. Such a finding is not required for potentially significant environmental effects that are not considered peculiar to the parcel or the project if uniformly applied development policies or standards were previously adopted by the agency with a finding that the policies or standards would substantially mitigate the environmental effect when applied to future projects. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15183(f).) When the agency has failed to make such a finding previously, it can do so when it approves the later project.

Often, such certified prior EIRs are Program EIRs and, in fact, the factual questions as to whether project impacts fall within the scope of the prior EIR are very similar. As to reliance on a Program EIR, later activities are examined to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared. (State CEQA Guidelines § $15168(\mathrm{c})$. .) As the commenter notes, if a later activity would result in environmental effects that were not examined in the Program EIR, the agency must prepare an initial study to determine whether an EIR or negative declaration is required to address those effects. (Id.) However, as is the case here, if a later activity would not have any effects that were not examined in the Program EIR (including any new or more severe impacts), the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the Program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required. (Id.)
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Factors that an agency may consider in determining whether a later activity is within the scope of a Program EIR include "consistency of the later activity with the type of allowable land use, overall planned density and building intensity, geographic area analyzed for environmental impacts, and covered infrastructure as described in the program EIR." (State CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c).) An agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the Program EIR into later activities in the program. (Id.) "Where the later activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were within the scope of the program EIR." (Id.)

The City's Environmental Analysis complies with both Section 15183 and Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The commenter claims that an EIR is required for the Project. While the applicability of the exemption provided by State CEQA Guidelines 15183 does not turn on whether the City completes some form of preliminary review, here the City did use an environmental checklist which identifies whether or not each CEQA Appendix G environmental checklist question, and its corresponding impacts, were adequately addressed in the Lathrop General Plan EIR, if there is a significant impact due to new information, or if the Project would result in a significant impact peculiar to the Project site that was not adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR. The Environmental Analysis identifies the applicable City of Lathrop development standards and policies that would apply to the proposed Project during both the construction and operational phases, identifies applicable state-level standards and requirements, and explains how the application of these uniformly applied standards and policies would ensure that no peculiar or site-specific environmental impacts would occur. As such, there are no significant impacts associated with the proposed project that would be different from, or exceed the level of severity of any significant impacts identified in the General Plan EIR. As such, there is no need for the City to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the proposed Ashley Warehouse project.

Written correspondence from LIUNA is attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 12.

After review and consideration of all information provided, and after taking and considering all public testimony, the Planning Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to adopt Resolution No. 23-13, recommending the City Council find the project exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 and approve the Conditional Use Permit (CUP-23-08) and Site Plan Review (SPR-2309) for the proposed Ashley Furniture Project. The Planning Commission Resolution is attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 11.
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## CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 9, 2023

On October 9, 2023, the City Council held a public hearing on the proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP-23-08) and Site Plan Review (SPR-23-09) for the Ashley Furniture Project. The City Council received written correspondence from Mr. Michael R. Lozeau of Lozeau Drury, LLP, representing the Laborers' Union of North America, Local Union No. 73 (LIUNA) and from Manteca Unified School District (MUSD). The LIUNA letter is attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 13 and a written response is attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 15. The MUSD letter is attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 14.

## ANALYSIS:

Site Plan Review
As stated above, the proposed project includes the construction of a new $1,486,607$ sq. ft. concrete tilt-up building on an 89.82-acre site located at the northwest corner of Dos Reis Road and Manthey Road. The building will include the following uses:

| Use | Square Footage (sq. ft.) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Office | 24,000 |
| Retail Outlet | 110,260 |
| Warehouse Distribution <br> Facility | $1,352,347$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 4 8 6}, \mathbf{6 0 7}$ |

The building is generally located in the center of the subject parcel with a drive aisle providing access to all sides of the building. Off-street parking is provided both for passenger vehicles (employee parking and customer/public parking) and for commercial trucks and trailers.

Additionally, a customer pick-up area is located at the southeastern portion of the building, north of the Dos Reis automobile driveway. Customers will be guided to the customer pick up area office and directed to the specific pick-up bay.
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| Use | Square <br> Footage <br> (sq. ft.) | Automobile <br> Parking <br> Spaces <br> Required | Automobile <br> Parking Spaces <br> Provided | Commercial <br> Truck and <br> Trailer Spaces |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office | 24,000 | 1 per 400 sq. ft. <br> 60 spaces | 942 total <br> (Employee stalls <br> $=462)$ | 1,104 <br> $\left(12^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}=46\right)$ <br> $\left.\left(12^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\right)=261\right)$ |
| Retail <br> Outlet | 110,260 | 1 per 600 sq. ft. <br> 184 spaces | (Public stalls $=$ <br> $\left(12^{\prime} \times 53^{\prime}=797\right)$ |  |
| Warehouse | $1,352,347$ | 1 per 2,000 sq. <br> ft. | $480)$ |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Automobile parking spaces are nine (9) by eighteen (18) feet in size, meeting the dimension requirements pursuant to Section 17.76.030, Standards for off-street and on-street parking facilities. Of the 942 automobile parking spaces provided, twenty (20) are handicap accessible (including four (4) van accessible), 188 are Electric Vehicle (EV) capable parking spaces, and twelve (12) are EV parking spaces pursuant to California building Code (CBC) requirements.

As noted in the table above, the commercial truck and trailer spaces include a variety of sizes to accommodate single trailers and the commercial truck cab and tailer. Commercial truck and trailer parking is located primarily on the eastern portion of the Site Plan and along the northern and southern property line.

## Architecture

The proposed building is designed as a concrete tilt-up structure with colored wall accents and glass treatments near the outlet/showroom entrance and employee entrances. The elevation facing S. Manthey Road and Interstate 5 (I-5) will convey a high-quality office/retail appearance while maintaining key functions, including customer pick-up area along the southeast elevation. The appearance is achieved with glazing to indicate an office appearance and clerestory windows along the upper potions of the façade. The building also includes accent shading features, variations in parapet height and colors. Collectively, these provide for enhanced visual interest and varied building massing, to create distinctive points of entry for users. The following is a portion of the east elevation and a rendering looking at the building from S. Manthey Road.
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Looking West from S. Manthey Road


Looking West from S. Manthey Road
The building varies in height from 46 feet to 60 feet. The tallest height of the building is located at the entrance, facing S. Manthey Road (illustrated above). The distribution warehouse portion of the building is 46 feet to the parapet. The height fluctuates between 43 feet to 46 feet for the majority of the building. The maximum height allowed under the Limited Industrial Zoning District in the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment is 76 feet.
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## Floor Plan

As noted above, the proposed building will include a three-story, 24,000 sq. ft. office, two-story $110,260 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. retail outlet and showroom, and a 1,352,347 sq. ft. warehouse distribution center. The office is located within the northeastern portion of the building and will include a variety of offices, conference rooms, restrooms, and breakroom for each floor. The retail outlet and showroom will have an open floor plan, similar to the existing Ashley Furniture Outlet on S. Harlan Road. An escalator will provide access to the second floor retail outlet and showroom.

## Lighting

Lighting is proposed to be shielded and directed towards the parking and access areas only. As illustrated on the Photometric Plan (Attachment 6), lighting levels beyond the property line are at 0 candle power. Specific lighting detail, beyond the photometric plan will be refined as part of the Building Permit process.

Landscaping
Landscaping is provided throughout the project area and represents $10.4 \%(388,479$ sq. ft.) of the entire project area (excluding stormwater detention basins). Landscape treatment along Dos Reis Road and S. Manthey Road include a variety of large trees, screening trees (discussed further below), medium trees, shrubs and ground cover. Shade trees are proposed throughout the parking lot (public and employee parking areas) and at maturity, $73 \%$ of the parking area will be shaded, exceeding the City's requirement of $50 \%$. The Preliminary Landscape Plan is attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 8.

## Fencing and Walls

Proposed fencing and walls for the project are illustrated in the Screen Wall and Fencing Plan (Attachment 6). The proposed project will include three (3) fence types: wrought iron fencing, steel gate and solid tilt-up screen all. The wrought iron fencing will be utilized within the interior of the project, particularly to secure the employee parking area and along the northern and western property line. A steel sliding gate will be utilized at the access points to the employee parking area and the off-street parking area for trucks/trailers. A solid tilt-up screen wall will be utilized along a portion of the northern property line (along the commercial truck driveway) and the southern property line to screen the project from uses to the south.
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The following is a detail of the screen wall and metal gate:


Screening along Dos Reis Road
The proposed project includes a variety of strategies to screen the building and offstreet parking of commercial vehicles and trailers from Dos Reis Road and adjacent properties to the south. These strategies include the following:

1. Installation of an 8 -foot tall solid screen wall at the southern property line.
2. Planting of a mixture of deciduous shade trees and large evergreen trees for purposes of screening. As illustrated in the Preliminary Landscape Plan (Attachment 8), Deodar Cedar trees will be planted along Dos Reis Road at a maximum spacing of 40 feet. Deodar Cedar trees are a type of evergreen tree that keep its foliage year-round.

Chinese Flame Trees will also be planted along Dos Reis Road to assist in screening. The trees and landscaping will be installed between the 8 foot sidewalk and the $8^{\prime}$ wall along Dos Reis Road.
3. Providing an additional landscape buffer along Dos Reis Road. As illustrated in the cross-section of Dos Reis Road below, the project includes an additional 43 foot on-site landscape buffer adjacent to the public right-of-way. In addition to the landscape buffer north of Dos Reis Road within the public right-of-way, there is a total of 73 feet between the roadway and the off-street parking of commercial trucks/trailers.
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4. The building is setback 279 feet from the property line, which assists in limiting the sight line from Dos Reis Road. As illustrated in the Sight Line Exhibit below, the building is screened from view from the northern sidewalk along Dos Reis Road.

The applicant has prepared renderings of the proposed screening along Dos Reis Road, with mature trees and associated landscaping. The images below illustrate the proposed landscaping and screening strategies along Dos Reis Road. The full set of renderings are attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 9.


Looking North from Golden Valley Parkway


Looking Northeast from Dos Reis Road

## Traffic and Circulation

Passenger vehicle access to the project is provided via Dos Reis Road and S. Manthey Road. As noted above, the proposed project includes two (2) driveways from passenger vehicles, one (1) along Dos Reis Road, east of Golden Valley Parkway and the other along S. Manthey Road. An Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) driveway is located on Dos Reis Road, west of Golden Valley Parkway.

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared for the proposed project by TJKM Transportation Consultants. The Traffic Impact Analysis analyzed the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions - Intersection Level of Service
- Existing Conditions - Freeway Mainline Level of Service
- Baseline Conditions - Intersection Level of Service
- Baseline Conditions - Freeway Mainline Level of Service
- Baseline plus Project Conditions - Intersection Level of Service
- Baseline plus Project Conditions - Freeway Mainline Level of Service
- Cumulative Conditions - Intersection level of Service
- Cumulative plus Project Conditions - Intersection Level of Service

In addition to the Level of Service scenarios analyzed above, the Traffic Impact Analysis included a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis, consistent with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and Senate Bill 743.
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## Trip Generation

To determine the amount of peak hour and daily trips generated by the project, TJKM conducted a 24 -hour count at the existing Ashley Furniture facility located on S. Harlan Road. The approximate square footage of the existing Ashley Furniture facility is 525,000 sq. ft . and with this information and data collected from the 24-hour count, TJKM developed trip rates for the proposed project for passenger vehicles and heavy trucks. The following tables illustrate the trip generation for the proposed project.

Table 13: Project Trip Generation for Passenger Vehicles

|  | size | Daily |  | A.M. Peak |  |  |  |  | P.M. Peak |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rate | Trips | Rate | In:Out | In | Out | Total | Rate | In:Out | In | Out | Total |
| Proposed Uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ashley <br> Furniture | 1,500 ksf | 1.87 | 2,798 | 0.135 | 61:39 | 124 | 79 | 203 | 0.170 | $43: 57$ | 110 | 145 | 255 |
| Net Trips |  |  | 2,798 |  |  | 124 | 79 | 203 |  |  | 170 | 145 | 255 |

Table 14: Project Trip Generation for Heavy Trucks

| Land Use | Size |  | Daily |  | A.M. Peak |  |  |  |  | P.M. Peak |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Rate | Trips | Rate | In:Out | In | Out | Total | Rate | In:Out | In | Out | Total |
| Proposed Uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ashley | 1,500 | ksf | 0.453 | 680 | 0.063 | 15:85 | 14 | 81 | 95 | 0.030 | 69.31 | 31 | 14 | 45 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllll}\text { Furniture } & 1,500 & \text { ksf } & 0.453 & 680 & 0.063 & 15.85 & 14 & 81 & 95 & 0.030 & 69.31 & 31 & 14 & 45\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Trips |  |  |  | 680 |  |  | 14 | 81 | 95 |  |  | 31 | 74 | 45 |

As shown in the table above, the proposed project is projected to generate 2,798 daily passenger vehicles, 203 a.m. peak hour passenger vehicles, and 255 p.m. peak hour passenger vehicles. For heavy trucks, the proposed project is projected to generate 680 daily heavy trucks, 95 a.m. peak hour trucks, and 45 p.m. peak hour trucks.

## Trip Distribution

Pursuant to General Plan Implementation Action Lu-5.f and the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Amendment for Phase 2, truck traffic within the Limited Industrial area of the Specific Plan shall be limited to De Lima Road, and any future roadways north of Dos Reis Road, to connect to Manthey Road, Roth Road, and Interstate 5. Additionally, truck dependent development projects shall be prohibited from providing driveway access points off of Dos Reis Road, west of Golden Valley Parkway, other than Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) (Implementation Action LU-5.f (b)(iii).

The proposed project includes one (1) driveway dedicated to commercial trucks and is located on S. Manthey Road, within the northeastern portion of the project.
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Signage is proposed that will direct traffic north on S. Manthey Road and prohibit trucks from turning right on to $S$. Manthey Road toward Dos Reis Road and Golden Valley Parkway.


## Traffic Impact Analysis Results

The intersection level of service analysis for Baseline plus Project Conditions results in three (3) intersections operating at unacceptable service levels during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. It is important to note that the following intersection already operates at unacceptable level of service without the addition of project traffic:

- Lathrop Road/I-5 Northbound Ramps degrades to LOS F in the p.m. peak hour, with an increase in average delay of 19.1 seconds.

The following two (2) intersections would degrade from acceptable to unacceptable level of service with the addition of project traffic:

- Lathrop Road-Spartan Way/I-5 Southbound Ramps would degrade from LOS $D$ to LOS $E$ in the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, a substantial degradation.
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- Spartan Way/Golden Valley Parkway intersection would degrade from LOS C to LOS E in the a.m. peak hour and LOS D to LOS F in the p.m. peak hour, a substantial degradation.

To improve the traffic flow for the three (3) above noted intersections, the Traffic Impact Analysis recommends the following improvements:

- A separate right-turn lane added to the Lathrop Road/I-5 Northbound off-ramp as well as signal timing to improve the intersection operation to LOS C in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The new lane should provide at least 400 ft . of vehicle storage.
- For the Lathrop Road/I-5 Southbound off-ramp, adjusting the signal timing of the existing traffic lights will improve the intersection operate to LOS D in the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. Widening is not necessary for the Baseline plus Project Conditions at the southbound off-ramp.
- For Spartan Way/Golden Valley parkway, the TIA recommends making adjustments to the lane geometry (number of turn lanes, through lanes, and right-turn lanes) to improve the efficiency of the intersection.

These improvements have been incorporated into the proposed project's Conditions of Approval. The TIA is attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 10.

## Utilities

Potable water will be supplied to the proposed project by the City of Lathrop via connection to an existing 12" water line in Golden Valley Parkway, south of Dos Reis Road. The CLSP Phase 2 Amendment states that water supply to the plan area will be provided from the City's existing groundwater wells and potable surface water from the South County Surface Water Supply Program (SCSWSP) by the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID).

Wastewater generated by the project will be treated by the City's Consolidated Treatment Facility (CTF) along Christopher Way, southeast of the project site. The project will connect to an existing 24" sanitary sewer line in Golden Valley parkway, south of Dos Reis Road. As part of the project's Conditions of Approval, the applicant is required to secure sufficient sewer treatment capacity, including treatment at the City's CTF.

Per the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment, stormwater runoff from the plan area is designed to discharge into the San Joaquin River through an existing outfall located near the southwest corner of the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment Plan Area at the end of Dos Reis Road and the existing outfall within the Phase 1 area.
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The CLSP Phase 2 Amendment Plan Area consists of two (2) major drainage sheds with underground storage pipes to reduce the peak discharge from the plan area to the San Joaquin River. The project site is located within Watershed 4, which includes both CLSP Phase 1 and the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment areas. The proposed project will connect to the existing 54" Stormdrain line in Golden Valley Parkway, south of Dos Reis Road. Stormwater will be treated on-site with Best Management Practices (BMPs) through a series of bio-detention basins prior to entering the City system. The Civil Plans are attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 7.

## Zoning Consistency

The project site will be located within the IL-CL, Limited Industrial Zoning District in which a Zoning Map and Municipal Code Amendment is also being processed by the City for consistency with the recently adopted General Plan. Chapter 17.62, Article 6 , and Article 12 will provide guidance and development requirements for projects located within this District. Section 17.62 .061 of the Zoning Ordinance will be amended as part of the General Plan consistency effort to state the following: "the IL-CL district is intended to provide opportunities for certain types of limited industrial uses; provide adequate space to meet the needs of modern industrial development, including off-street parking and truck loading areas; and to provide industrial employment opportunities for residents of the city and region." Principal uses include but are not limited to assembly of small electrical equipment and appliances, various manufacturing uses, lumber yards, public utility and public service structures, public buildings and grounds, business parks and incubator spaces, research development industry and business support services and warehouse and distribution facilities.
The proposed project is considered a principal use.
Table 17.62.120(B), Central Lathrop Specific Plan: Industrial Development Standards provides the development standards required of the IL-CL District, and the table below depicts the conformance determination between the Zoning Ordinance and the proposed project.
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| Development Standard | IL-CL Zone District | Proposed Project |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Dimensions |  |  |
| Lot Size (Minimum) | No Minimum or Maximum Requirement | 89.82-acres |
| Setbacks (Minimum) |  |  |
| Front/Rear/Side | 15 feet / 0 feet / 0 feet | Front: Approximately 418-feet from S. Manthey Road <br> Side: Approximately 279feet from Dos Reis Road and 220 -feet from then northern property line. Rear: Approximately 704feet from the rear property line. |
| Maximum Building Height | Seventy-six (76) feet | 60-feet |
| Off-Street Parking | ```Office - 1 per 400 square feet = 60 spaces Retail - 1 per 600 square feet = 184 spaces Warehouse - 1 per 2,000 square feet = 676 spaces Total required: }92``` | 942 total $($ Employee stalls $=462)$ $($ Public stalls $=480)$ 1,104 truck and trailer spaces $\left(12^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}, 40^{\prime}\right.$, and $53^{\prime}$ |
| Landscaping | $10 \%$ of Site shall be landscaped | 10.4\% (388,618 square feet of landscaping) |
| Hours of Operation | No Specific Limit | ```Retail - 9:00 am to 9:00pm Office - TBD Distribution - TBD``` |

Based on Staff's review, the proposed project is consistent with the requirements of the IL-CL Zoning District.

## Design Guidelines

The Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) Phase 2 Amendment includes a variety of principles and standards related to land use, site design, and architecture. Staff has reviewed the proposed project Site Plan, Building Elevations, Landscape Plans, and Architecture (Attachments 6 through 8) and has determined that overall compliance with the Design Guidelines listed in the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment has been achieved.
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Where applicable, Conditions of Approval have been incorporated to the proposed project to address the following improvements: perimeter wall treatment, on-site lighting, screening of exterior building equipment (e.g., mechanical equipment, $A / C$, etc.), screening of commercial truck and trailer storage, and landscape buffer requirements and treatment.

## General Plan

The project site has a General Plan Land Use Designation of LI, Limited Industrial. The intent of the IL land use designation is to, "accommodate a wide range of jobsgenerating uses, including business parks; clean light industrial; research and development (R\&D); science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM); tech/biotech manufacturing; high-tech services that incorporate some combination of assembly, warehousing, and/or sales, hospitals and other health care-related uses, warehouses and distribution centers."

The Ashley Furniture Project has been reviewed by Staff for consistency with the General Plan and finds that the proposed project is consistent with the following General Plan Policies and Implementation Actions (consistency statements are in italics):

LU-5.1 Require new development to be compatible and complementary to existing development. Where appropriate and feasible, promote connections between neighborhoods and services and facilities.

As noted above, the subject property has a General Plan Land Use Designation of $L I$, Limited Industrial and will be located within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) Phase 2 Amendment area IL, Limited Industrial Zoning District. The proposed project would improve and extend Golden Valley Parkway and construct a roundabout at the intersection of Dos Reis Road and Golden Valley Parkway which would provide connection to the CLSP Phase 1 area for passenger vehicles. The proposed use is compatible with the IL, Limited Industrial Zoning District and the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment.

LU-5.4 In industrial areas located within 1,000 feet of existing or planned sensitive receptors, promote industrial uses that are environmentally sustainable with limited potential to create nuisances such as noise and odors.

An Environmental Noise Assessment, prepared by Saxelby Acoustics and a Health Risk Assessment (HRA), prepared by De Novo Planning Group were prepared to analyze the noise and health risks impacts associated with the proposed project, respectively.
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As noted in the Environmental Noise Assessment, the City's General Plan limits stationary noise increases to 3 dBA, or the City's noise standards (daytime (7:00 am to $10: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ ) maximum of 55 dBA and nighttime (10:00 pm to 7:00 am) maximum of 45 dBA). The average ambient noise level during nighttime hours at the closest sensitive receptors to the southwest is $54 d B A L_{\text {eq }}$. At the sensitive receptors to the southwest, a project-generated noise level of 51 dBA $L_{\text {eq }}$ would result in a total noise level of $54 d B A L_{\text {eq, }}$ resulting in a $3 d B A$ increase. Therefore, the nighttime noise level standard applicable to the proposed project is $51 \mathrm{dBA} L_{\text {eq }}$.

The primary noise source associated with operation of the proposed project is truck and automobile circulation and loading docks. Single family residential land uses are located to the north, west, and south of the project, Lathrop High School is located to the west of the project, and Interstate 5 is located directly east of the project. Saxelby Acoustics conducted noise measurements at the existing Ashley Facility located on S. Harlan Road. Measurements were conducted in the loading dock area during a weekday peak hour of use. Activities during the peak hour include truck arrival/departures, truck idling, truck backing, air brake release, passenger vehicle trips to and from docks, and operation of forklifts. Loading dock activity was found to generate continuous average noise levels of approximately $57 d B A L_{e q}$ at the edge of the truck maneuvering lanes, approximately 120 feet from the façade of the building at the center of the loading area. Saxelby Acoustics took these measurements and utilized SoundPLAN to predict noise levels for the proposed project.

The proposed project is predicted to generate noise levels up to $45 d B A L_{e q}$ at the nearest residences to the southwest and $39 d B A L_{\text {eq }}$ at the residences to the northeast, resulting in a maximum increase of 0.9 dBA at nearby residences. This complies with the adjusted nighttime noise level standard of 51 dBA $L_{e q}$ and limit of $3 d B A$ increase. Therefore, the Environmental Noise Assessment did not recommend any additional noise control measures to achieve compliance with the City's noise level standards.

Although not specifically required to achieve noise level standards, the proposed project includes an 8-foot tall solid wall along the southern property line and a portion of the northern property as required by the Lathrop Municipal Code when an industrial use is adjacent to a residential use and for screening purposes along Dos Reis Road. This will assist in reducing noise exposure from the operation of the Ashley Furniture project. Additionally, the project is required to adhere to California Air Resources Board (CARB) rules and regulations for use of diesel fueled fleets, including limiting the idling time for heavy trucks to five (5) minutes.
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The HRA was prepared to evaluate whether or not the estimated construction and operational toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions generated from the proposed project will cause significant impacts to the local air resources in the project area, in particular, sensitive receptors such as residences located in proximity to the project. The results of the risk analysis indicate that cancer risks vary depending on the exposure scenario (residential or worker) and on location. Locations nearest the project site have the greatest exposure and the associated risks are considerably lower as distance from the project site increases. None of the exposure levels at any of the nearby sensitive receptors exceed any of the thresholds of significance established by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) for residents or workers. This finding applies to both cancer risks and non-cancer chronic long term exposure to diesel particulate matter (DPM).

LU-5.5 Ensure that industrial development projects, including warehouse, distribution, logistics, and fulfillment projects, mitigate adverse impacts (including health risks and nuisances) to nearby residential land uses and other existing and planned sensitive receptors.

As noted above, a Health Risk Assessment, prepared by De Novo Planning Group has been prepared as part of the Environmental Checklist. The HRA findings are described above. The HRA concluded that the project would not exceed any of the applicable thresholds of significance related to toxic air contaminants and health risks.

LU-5a Through the development review process, screen development proposals for land use and transportation network compatibility with existing surrounding or abutting development or neighborhoods.

As noted above, a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared for the proposed project by TJKM Transportation Consultants to evaluate the impacts of the transportation infrastructure due to the addition of traffic from the proposed project. The report also evaluates project site access and on-site circulation for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. The proposed project includes a dedicated truck driveway located at the northeastern portion of the project site with full access to S. Manthey Road.

This driveway is approximately 488-feet in length and provides double-stacking for trucks entering the site and a single lane exiting the site. As required by the City's General Plan, trucks are prohibited from utilizing Golden Valley Parkway, Dos Reis Road west of Golden Valley Parkway, Spartan Way, and Lathrop Road. As such, trucks entering and exiting the site will utilize Roth Road and S. Manthey Road.
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LU-5.b Through the development review process, analyze land use compatibility and require adequate buffers and/or architectural enhancements to protect sensitive receptors from intrusion of development activities that may cause unwanted nuisances and health risks.

The proposed project includes a landscape buffer and screening along Dos Reis Road. The buffer includes a 43 feet of on-site landscaping in addition to the 30 feet of landscaping within the public right-of-way adjacent to Dos Reis Road. Landscaping will include a mixture of deciduous shade trees and large evergreen trees for the purpose of screening.

LU-5.c When industrial projects, including warehouse projects, fulfillment centers, and other projects that may generate high volumes of truck trips and/or air quality emissions are proposed within 1,000 feet of existing or planned residential sues or other sensitive receptors, the City shall require the preparation of a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) that meets the standards established by the Office of Environmental Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). Projects shall not be approved until it can be demonstrated that the project would not result in an exceedance of the established threshold of significance for public health risks at nearby sensitive receptors.

As noted above, an HRA, prepared by De Novo Planning Group, has been prepared as part of the Initial Study Checklist. The HRA was prepared in accordance with the standards established by OEHHA and SJVAPCD. The HRA findings are presented above.


#### Abstract

LU-5.d When industrial projects, including warehouse projects, fulfillment centers, and other projects that may generate high volumes of truck trips and/or air quality emissions are proposed within 1,000 feet of existing or planned residential uses or other sensitive receptors, the City shall require the implementation of best management practices (BMPs) to reduce pollution exposure to sensitive receptors, particularly diesel particulate matter (DPM). The appropriate BMPs shall be established on a case-by-case basis, and should consider the following tools, methods, and approaches:
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- Creating physical, structural, and/or vegetative buffers that adequately prevent or substantially reduce pollutant dispersal between warehouses and any areas where sensitive receptors are likely to be present, such as homes, schools, daycare centers, hospitals, community centers, and parks.
- Providing adequate areas for on-site parking, on-site queueing and truck check-in that prevent trucks and other vehicles from parking or idling on public streets.
- Placing facility entry and exit points from the public street away from sensitive receptors, e.g., placing these points on the north side of the facility if sensitive receptors are adjacent to the south side of the facility. Exceptions can be made for emergency vehicle access (EVA) points.
- Locating warehouse dock doors and other onsite areas with significant truck traffic and noise away from sensitive receptors.
- Screening dock doors and onsite areas with significant truck traffic and noise with physical, structural, and/or vegetative barriers that adequately prevent or substantially reduce pollutant dispersal from the facility towards sensitive receptors.
- Posting signs clearly showing the designated entry and exit points from the public street for trucks and service vehicles.
- Posting signs indicating that all parking and maintenance of trucks must be conducted within designated on-site areas and not within the surrounding community or public streets.

The proposed project is consistent with Implementation Action LU-5.d as follows:

- As noted above, the proposed project includes the construction of an 8 foot tall solid wall along the majority of the southern property line and a portion of the northern property line. Additionally, the proposed project includes a onsite landscape buffer along Dos Reis Road approximately 43-feet in width and 30 feet of landscaping within the public right-of-way.
- Off-street parking is provided for passenger vehicles (employee parking and customer/public parking) and for commercial trucks and trailers. As noted above, the amount of off-street parking provided exceeds the minimum required pursuant to the Lathrop Municipal Code.
- The proposed project includes one (1) dedicated driveway for trucks, located along S. Manthey Road at the northeastern portion of the project site. The driveway allows stacking of approximately 488-feet with two (2) entry lanes and one (1) exit lane. Automobile driveways are located along S. Manthey Road (primary entry/exit) and Dos Reis Road. An additional Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) driveway is located on Dos Reis Road, west of Golden Valley Parkway.
- As noted above, the warehouse dock doors are located on the north and south sides of the proposed building.
- As noted above, the proposed project includes screening via an 8 foot solid wall and landscaping along the majority of the southern property line. Additionally, an 8 foot solid wall will be constructed along a portion of the northern property line, screening the truck entrance/exit drive aisle.
- The proposed project will be required to place on-site and off-site signage indicating that trucks must adhere to the City's Truck Route Ordinance.

LU-5.f Update the Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) to accomplish the following objectives:
a. Bring the Specific Plan's land use map into consistency with the General Plan Land Use Map (Figure LU-1)
b. Establish a circulation network that keeps future truck trips as far from existing and planned sensitive receptors as feasible; this includes, but not limited to, the following requirements, which shall be incorporated into the Specific Plan:
i. Trucks shall be prohibited on Dos Reis Road west and east of Golden Valley Parkway, on Golden Valley Parkway south of Dos Reis Road to Lathrop Road, and on Lathrop Road east of Golden Valley Parkway to Interstate 5 southbound off-ramp.
ii. Future truck dependent development projects shall be prohibited from providing driveway access points off of Dos Reis Road, west of Golden Valley Parkway, other than emergency vehicle access (EVA).
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iii. Truck traffic within the Limited Industrial Area of the Central Lathrop Specific Plan shall be limited to De Lima Road, and any future roadways north of Dos Reis Road, to connect to Manthey Road, Roth Road, and Interstate 5.
c. Establish site design standards for new industrial projects;
d. Identify financing and cost-recovery methods to fund roadway and infrastructure improvements.
e. Circulation design standards that promote safe transportation routes that limit impacts to developed areas to the south, and connectivity enhancements to provide better connectivity to I-5.
f. Infrastructure improvements to improve roadway operations.
g. Opportunities to provide employee-serving amenities onsite, such as parks and plazas, outdoor seating areas, fitness facilities, and daycare centers as a means to reduce vehicle trips, while supporting air quality, public health, and sustainability goals.
h. Include provisions that all development projects proposed north of Dos Reis Road and south of De Lima Road be required to obtain a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), which shall be subject to discretionary review by the City Council.

The proposed project is consistent with the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment design guidelines, policies, and land uses. The City is processing the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment concurrently with the Zoning Consistency Update and the Ashley Furniture Project. The CLSP Phase 2 Amendment has been prepared consistent with the requirements established by this General Plan Action.

## Conditional Use Permit

The General Plan and Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) Phase 2 Amendment requires all development projects proposed between Dos Reis Road and De Lima Road to obtain a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) subject to discretionary review by the Planning Commission and the City Council.
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The Planning Commission and City Council must make certain findings when approving a Conditional Use Permit:

1. That there are circumstances or conditions applicable to the land, structure, or use which makes the granting of a use permit necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right;
2. That the proposed location of the conditional use is in accordance with the objectives of the zoning code and the purposes of the district in which the site is located;
3. That the proposed use will comply with each of the applicable provisions of this the LMC.

Staff has reviewed each of the findings presented above and suggests that the proposed project location is consistent with the City's zoning code and is a permitted use within the zoning district in which the site is located.

## Site Plan Review

In accordance with Chapter 17.100, Site Plan Review, of the Lathrop Municipal Code (LMC), the Planning Commission must make the following findings when approving a Site Plan:

1. That the site plan complies with all applicable provisions of this chapter;
2. That the site improvements listed (a. through i.) are so arranged that traffic congestion is avoided and that pedestrian and vehicular safety and welfare are protected, and there will not be adverse effect on surrounding property;
3. Proposed lighting is so arranged as to deflect the light away from adjoining properties;
4. Proposed signs will comply with all of the applicable provisions of Section 17.16.010 and Chapters 17.64 through 17.72, 17.80 and 17.84;
5. That adequate provision is made to reduce adverse or potentially adverse environmental impacts to acceptable levels.

Staff has reviewed each of the findings presented above and suggests that the proposed project has been designed so that the use is compatible with the surrounding land uses and will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the City.
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## Conditions of Approval

Planning staff routed the project plans on February 14, 2023 and May 17, 2023 to the Building Division, Public Works Department, Lathrop-Manteca Fire District, Lathrop Police Department for review and to ensure compliance with applicable codes and requirements. Planning staff also routed the project plans on June 1, 2023 to various non-City agencies. The City received comments from the following agencies:

- Caltrans
- San Joaquin Council of Governments
- San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
- South San Joaquin Irrigation District
- Pacific Gas \& Electric

The Caltrans letter stated that the project has the potential to significantly impact the interchange and requested that a Traffic Impact Study be submitted to Caltrans for review and comment prior to project approval.

As noted above, City staff routed the Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by TJKM to Caltrans on July 12, 2023. The City received a letter from Caltrans on August 9, 2023 with comments on the Traffic Impact Study. The majority of the comments were associated with the technical aspects of the Traffic Impact Study, such utilizing Caltran's Three County Travel Demand Model, trip count year, and request for an explanation why Lathrop Interchange is not being utilized by trucks. TJKM will continue to work with Caltrans to refine the Traffic Impact Study. As noted above, the applicant will be required to construct a separate right-turn lane to the Lathrop Road/I-5 Northbound off-ramp ( 400 ft . of vehicle storage) which will require an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans. The applicant is working with Caltran's to address their concerns.

SJCOG provided information regarding the project's participation in the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP) and that the project is located within the Airport Influence Zone pursuant to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUC). Additional review has been completed by SJCOG and the project was found to be compatible with the ALUC.

The San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department provided requirements for geotechnical drilling and process for abandonment and destruction of any wells or septic systems on the property.
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San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) provided comments on measures to reduce air quality impacts associated with diesel vehicles and industrial projects, instructions for preparation of a Health Risk Screening/Assessment and the District's Rules and Regulations.

The Pacific Gas \& Electric (PGE) letter provided requirements for planting trees and shrubs along S. Manthey Road and underneath existing PG\&E overhead pole line and that any planting in this area must comply with PG\&E's guide to Trees and Shrubs for Power Line-Friendly Landscaping.

As a result, staff developed a consolidated list of conditions (Attachment 3). Staff finds that the proposed project has been properly conditioned to meet the City's standards and requirements.

## Public Notice

A Notice of Public Hearing was advertised in the Manteca Bulletin on September 29, 2023. Staff also mailed the public hearing notice to notify property owners located within a 300 -foot radius from the project site boundary. In addition, the Public Notice was emailed to the City's Public Hearing subscribers and interested parties and posted at three (3) locations accessible to the public and the City website.

## CEQA REVIEW:

California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 allows for a streamlined environmental review process for projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site.

If the above qualifications are met, as stated in Section 15183(b), "a public agency shall limit its examination of environmental effects to those which the agency determines, in an initial study or other analysis:

1. Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located;
2. Were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent;
3. Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action; or
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4. Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe impact than discussed in the prior EIR.

A detailed environmental analysis, prepared in the form of an Environmental Checklist with supporting technical analysis, has been prepared by De Novo Planning Group, to provide analysis of three distinct, yet closely related actions being contemplated by the City. These include an update to the Lathrop Municipal Code (LMC) and Zoning Map (Zoning Consistency Update), and update to the Phase 2 (CLSP Phase 2 Amendment) and the proposed Ashley Furniture Project. The three (3) projects are being implemented as a result of the City's comprehensive General Plan update, which was adopted on September 19, 2022. The General Plan Update provides a framework for future growth and projects the development reasonably expected during the build-out of the City. The Lathrop General Plan Update EIR analyzed the environmental impacts associated with adoption and implementation of the General Plan. All three of the actions analyzed in the Environmental Checklist are consistent with the General Plan, and were analyzed and accounted for in the General Plan EIR.

- Biological Resources Analysis Report;
- Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report;
- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report;
- Shallow Soil Investigation Report;
- The CLSP Phase 2 Document;
- Acoustical Assessment;
- Air Quality-Health Risk Assessment Technical Report;
- Traffic Impact Analysis; and
- Ashley Furniture Project CalEEMod output file.

The Environmental Analysis includes a discussion and analysis of any peculiar or sitespecific environmental impacts associated with adoption of the Municipal Code and Zoning Map Update, adoption of the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment, and construction and operation of the proposed Ashley Furniture Project.

The Environmental Analysis identifies whether or not each CEQA Appendix G environmental checklist question, and its corresponding impacts, were adequately addressed in the 2022 Lathrop General Plan EIR, if there is a significant impact due to new information, or if the project would result in a significant impact peculiar to the project site that was not adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR.
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The Environmental Analysis identifies the applicable City of Lathrop development standards and policies that would apply to the proposed project during both the construction and operational phases, identifies applicable minimization measures from the General Plan EIR that must be implemented, identifies applicable state-level standards and policies that would ensure that no peculiar or site-specific environmental impacts would occur.

The Environmental Analysis concluded that the proposed project is consistent with the land uses and development intensities assigned to the project site by the General Plan.

Impacts from buildout of the General Plan including cumulative impacts associated with development and buildout of the CLSP Phase 2 plan area and the Ashley Furniture Project, as proposed, were fully addressed in the General Plan EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2021100139), and implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new or altered impacts beyond those addressed in the General Plan EIR.

All project requirements identified in the Environmental Checklist are incorporated in project Consolidated Conditions of Approval (Attachment 3). The Environmental Checklist is attached to this Staff Report as Attachment 10.

## RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission and staff recommend that the City Council consider all information provided and submitted, take and consider all public testimony and, if determined to be appropriate, adopt a Resolution to Find the Project Exempt from Further Environmental Review Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 and Adopt a Resolution to Approve a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review for the Ashley Furniture Project.

## FISCAL IMPACT:

All application processing fees and costs are charged to the applicant. The request has no fiscal impact to the City.
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## APPROVALS:
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## ATTACHMENTS:

1. City Council Resolution to Find the Project Exempt from Further Environmental Review Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183
2. City Council Resolution to Approve a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review for the Ashley Furniture Project
3. Consolidated Conditions of Approval, dated September 13, 2023
4. Vicinity Map
5. Project Description
6. Architectural Plans
7. Preliminary Civil Plans
8. Preliminary Landscape Plan
9. Perspective Views/Renderings
10.Environmental Checklist, prepared by De Novo Planning Group, dated August, 2023 with Appendices
11.Planning Commission Resolution No. 23-13 Recommending City Council Approval
10. Comment Letter, dated September 13, 2023, from Lozeau Drury LLP regarding the Ashley Furniture Project
11. Comment Letter, dated October 6, 2023, from Lozeau Drury LLP regarding the Ashley Furniture Project
14.Comment Letter, dated September 28, 2023, from Manteca Unified School District (MUSD) regarding the Ashley Furniture Project
15.Response to Lozeau Drury LLP letter dated October 6, 2023 regarding the Ashley Furniture Project

## RESOLUTION NO. 23-

## A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LATHROP FINDING THE PROJECT EXEMPTION FROM FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21083.3 AND CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15183 (CUP-23-08 AND SPR-23-09)

WHEREAS, the City of Lathrop City Council held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review pursuant to the General Plan and Lathrop Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the request is for approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review to allow the construction of an approximately 1.5 million square foot concrete tilt-up building and all necessary supporting infrastructure on a property located within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment area as further defined below in the third recital (the proposed Project or the Project); and

WHEREAS, the property is located at 14101 S. Manthey Road (APN: 192-020-14) (the property); and

WHEREAS, prior to the City's approval of the 2022 General Plan Update, the City prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which analyzed the environmental impacts of buildout under the General Plan Update pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et. seq.), and the City of Lathrop City Council certified the Final EIR on September 19, 2022 (State Clearinghouse \#2021100139); and

WHEREAS, the analysis in the General Plan Update EIR allows the use of CEQA exemption/streamlining provisions for projects under the General Plan Update, including the proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, an Environmental Checklist has been prepared for the proposed Project, which is attached to the City Council Staff Report as Attachment 9 and can also be found in the Planning Division project files located at 390 Towne Centre Drive, Lathrop, CA 95330; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the proposed Project is consistent with the Limited Industrial land use goals and policies of the City of Lathrop General Plan and is also consistent with the development standards for the IL-CL, Limited Industrial Zoning District and the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment as further implemented through the Zoning Code Text Amendment; and

WHEREAS, the City of Lathrop Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on September 13, 2023, to consider the proposed Project and after reviewing and considering all information provided and submitted, and after taking and considering all public testimony adopted Resolution No. 23-13 recommending City Council find the Project exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183; and

Resolution No. 23-

WHEREAS, proper notice of this public hearing was given in all respects as required by law including the publishing of a legal notice of the hearing in the Manteca Bulletin on or about September 29, 2023 and mailed out to property owners located within a 300-foot radius from the project site boundary on September 29, 2023, emailed to the City's Public Hearing subscribers and interested parties and posted at three (3) locations accessible to the public and the City website; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has utilized its own independent judgement in adopting this Resolution.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Lathrop does hereby make the following findings:

Section 1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183, the City Council finds and determines as follows:
a. The project complies with CEQA based on the CEQA exemption/streamlining provisions contained in Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183;
b. Pursuant to the City Council Staff Report and the attachments and exhibits thereto, including but not limited to, the CEQA Environmental Checklist, which are incorporated herein by reference, the proposed Project will not result in any significant impacts that: 1) are peculiar to the project or project site; 2) were not identified as significant projectlevel, cumulative, or off-site effects in the General Plan Update EIR; or 3) were previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the General Plan Update EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the General Plan Update EIR. As a result, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183, the proposed Project is exempt from further environmental review under CEQA.
c. All applicable General Plan Update policy and implementation actions and uniformly applied development policies, standards and/or regulations are, hereby imposed on the proposed Project and must be adhered to by the Project applicant.

Resolution No. 23-

To the extent the City has not previously made findings regarding any/all of these referenced General Plan policy and implementation actions and uniformly applied development policies, standards and/or regulations, the City Council finds that all of those General Plan Update policy and implementation actions and uniformly applied development policies, standards and/or regulations, were adopted, in whole or in part, to substantially mitigate the potential environmental effects to which they pertain (i.e., aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gases, climate change, and energy, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, population, and housing, mineral resources, noise, public services and recreation, circulation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire).

Section 2. Based on the findings set forth in this Resolution and the evidence in the Staff Report, the City Council hereby find the Project Exempt from Further Environmental Review Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 as illustrated and incorporated by reference as Attachment 10 of the City Council Staff Report.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Lathrop, based on substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings, its above findings, including the staff report and associated attachments, pursuant to its independent review and consideration, does hereby find the Project exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183.

The foregoing resolution was passed and adopted this $13^{\text {th }}$ day of November 2023 by the following vote of the City Council, to wit:

## AYES:

NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

## SIGNED:

## Sonny Dhaliwal, Mayor

## ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


Salvador Navarrete, City Attorney

## RESOLUTION NO. 23-

## A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LATHROP APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR THE ASHLEY FURNITURE PROJECT (CUP-23-08 AND SPR-23-09)

WHEREAS, the City of Lathrop City Council held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review pursuant to the General Plan and Lathrop Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the request is for approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review to allow the construction of an approximately 1.5 million square foot concrete tilt-up building and all necessary supporting infrastructure on a property located within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment area as further defined below in the third recital (the proposed Project or the Project); and

WHEREAS, the property is located at 14101 S. Manthey Road (APN: 192-020-14) (the property); and

WHEREAS, prior to the City's approval of the 2022 General Plan Update, the City prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which analyzed the environmental impacts of buildout under the General Plan Update pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et. seq.), and the City of Lathrop City Council certified the Final EIR on September 19, 2022 (State Clearinghouse \#2021100139); and

WHEREAS, the analysis in the General Plan Update EIR allows the use of CEQA exemption/streamlining provisions for projects under the General Plan Update, including the proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, an Environmental Checklist has been prepared for the proposed Project, which is attached to the City Council Staff Report as Attachment 10 and can also be found in the Planning Division project files located at 390 Towne Centre Drive, Lathrop, CA 95330; and

WHEREAS, prior to approval of the Project, the City Council adopted a Resolution to find the Project exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the proposed Project is consistent with the Limited Industrial land use goals and policies of the City of Lathrop General Plan and is also consistent with the development standards for the IL-CL, Limited Industrial Zoning District and the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment as further implemented through the Zoning Code Text Amendment; and

Resolution No. 23-

WHEREAS, the City of Lathrop Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on September 13, 2023, to consider the proposed Project and after reviewing and considering all information provided and submitted, and after taking and considering all public testimony adopted Resolution No. 23-13 recommending City Council approval of the proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, proper notice of this public hearing was given in all respects as required by law including the publishing of a legal notice of the hearing in the Manteca Bulletin on or about September 29, 2023 and mailed out to property owners located within a 300 -foot radius from the project site boundary on September 29, 2023, emailed to the City's Public Hearing subscribers and interested parties and posted at three (3) locations accessible to the public and the City website; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has utilized its own independent judgement in adopting this Resolution.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Lathrop does hereby make the following findings:

Section 1. Conditional Use Permit Findings. Pursuant to Section 17.112.060 of the Lathrop Municipal Code (LMC), the City Council finds as follows:
a. That there are circumstances or conditions applicable to the land, structure or use which makes the granting of a use permit necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right. The proposed Project represents a major expansion of the existing Ashley Furniture Distribution Center and Retail Outlet located on S. Harlan Road. The proposed Project is consistent with the City's development standards for Limited Industrial.
b. That the proposed location of the conditional use is in accordance with the objectives of the zoning code and the purposes of the district in which the site is located. The proposed Project is located in the $I L-C L$, Limited Industrial Zoning District and the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment area and is a permitted use within the zoning district for which it is located as further established in the Zoning Code Text Amendment.
c. That the proposed use will comply with each of the applicable provisions of the LMC, as amended. As noted above and as described in the Staff Report, the proposed Project is a permitted use in the ILCL, Limited Industrial Zoning District and is consistent with the applicable provisions in the LMC, including screening requirements pursuant to the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment. Additionally, the General Plan requires updates to the LMC and Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 in order to ensure that new development is compatible with existing development (Goal LU-5).

Resolution No. 23-

The proposed Project is consistent with the LMC, Policies and Implementation Actions of the General Plan as it relates to truck traffic impacts and land use compatibility.

Section 2. Site Plan Review Findings. Pursuant to Section 17.100.050 of the Lathrop Municipal Code (LMC), the City Council finds as follows:
a. The proposed Site Plan Review complies with all applicable provisions of Chapter 17.100;
b. The proposed Site Plan Review is consistent with the site improvements listed in Chapter 17.100 (a. through i.) and improvements are such that traffic congestion is avoided and pedestrian and vehicular safety and welfare are protected and there will not be adverse effects on surrounding properties;
c. Proposed lighting for the project area is so arranged as to deflect away from adjoining properties; and
d. The proposed Site Plan Review is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the City as further evaluated in the Environmental Checklist.

Section 3. Based on the findings set forth in this Resolution and the evidence in the Staff Report, the City Council hereby approve Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-23-08 and Site Plan Review No. SPR-23-09 subject to the Consolidated Conditions of Approval as illustrated and incorporated by reference as Attachment 3 of the City Council Staff Report.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Lathrop, based on substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings, its above findings, including the staff report and associated attachments, pursuant to its independent review and consideration, does hereby approve Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-23-08 and Site Plan Review No. SPR-23-09, subject to the Consolidated Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment 3 of the November 13, 2023 City Council Staff Report and incorporated by reference herein

The foregoing resolution was passed and adopted this $13^{\text {th }}$ day of November 2023 by the following vote of the City Council, to wit:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

## SIGNED:

## Sonny Dhaliwal, Mayor

## ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


Teresa Vargas, City Clerk
Salvador Navarrete, City Attorney

# Community Development Department - Planning Division 

## Amended Consolidated Conditions of Approval

September 13, 2023

Project Name:
File Number:
Project Address: 14101 S. Manthey Road (APN: 192-020-14)

The following list of conditions shall be incorporated into the final construction plans and development phases of the project. The list of conditions are not intended to be all-inclusive or a comprehensive listing of all City or district regulations. Please note that additional comments andior conditions may be added pending the response to the comments noted below and or changes to the proposed project. The following comments and conditions of approval are based on the application and diagrams dated May, 2023.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Approval of this project authorizes the construction of a $1,486,607 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. concrete tilt-up building on a 89.82 -acre property located at the northwest corner of Dos Reis Road and Manthey Road and within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment area. The proposed building will include an up to three-story, 24,000 sq. ft. office, an up to two-story $110,260 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. retail outlet and showroom and a $1,352,347 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. warehouse distribution center. The project includes related on- and off-site improvements, including but not limited to off-street parking, lighting, landscaping, solid wall and wrought iron fencing, outdoor employee break area, paving, and street improvements (landscaping, curb, gutter, and sidewalk

## CEQA DETERMINATION

Exempt in accordance with Section 21083.3 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

## PLANNING

1. The project is subject to and shall comply with the Project Requirements resulting from the Environmental Checklist prepared by De Novo Planning Group. The Project Requirements are incorporated by reference into this list of conditions (attached).
2. The Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review shall not be in effect until the Rezone that is part of the City's Zoning Consistency Project and Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) Phase 2 Amendment are approved and in effect.
3. Signs (Directional Signs) shall be placed on-site directing trucks north on S. Manthey Road towards Roth Road from the site. Signage shall be maintained by the applicant/property owner and replaced if damaged, destroyed or otherwise unreadable. Signage shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division.
4. Sign(s) shall be placed in the drivers' lounge and/or breakroom associated with the project building directing trucks north on S. Manthey Road toward Roth Road from the site. The sign shall illustrate the Truck Route to and from the site, the City’s Truck Route Map and a reference to Chapter 10.16, Truck Routes and Commercial Vehicles of the Lathrop Municipal Code (LMC).
5. Evergreen trees planted along Dos Reis Road for the purposes of screening shall be in compliance with the CLSP Phase 2 Amendment.
6. Outdoor employee break area(s) shall include trash receptacles, shade structure(s), and seating areas. The final design and location of employee break area(s) shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
7. Passenger vehicle entryways shall include enhanced paving materials, such as herringbone design or stamped concrete. The extent of the enhanced paving materials shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
8. Interior truck operator lounge(s) and/or employee break area(s) shall include on-site amenities, such as restrooms, vending machines, air conditioning, seating areas, etc. The truck operator lounge(s) and/or employee break area(s) shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
9. With the exception of parking and storage of truck cabs and truck trailers, storage containers, and temporary load transfers, outdoor storage is prohibited, unless otherwise reviewed and approved by the Planning Division.
10. Installation of driveway entry/security gates or interior site fencing shall subject to review and approval by the Planning Division, Building Department and Lathrop Manteca Fire District prior to installation. All driveway entry/security gates shall provide truck queuing in front of the gate of at least seventy-five (75) feet in order to allow trucks with trailers to pull onto the site without blocking adjacent street rights-of-ways.
11. The security gate building (guard shack) shall be architecturally compatible with the primary building as it relates to color, aesthetic, and material.
12. On-site fencing shall be maintained and in good working order for the life of the project. Damage and/or wear-and-tear shall be repaired by the applicant/property owner in a timely manner.
13. Prior to any ground disturbance, the project shall consult with the San Joaquin County MultiSpecies Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP) for biological coverage, mitigation and participation in the plan. Participation in the SJMSCP satisfies requirements of both the State and Federal endangered species acts, and ensures that the impacts are mitigated below a level of significance in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
14. The applicant shall coordinate with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to comply with District rules and regulation including but not limited to Rule 9510, Indirect Source Review. The applicant shall provide proof of compliance prior to building permit issuance.
15. The project shall comply with applicable site development provisions contained in the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment Design Guidelines and Lathrop Municipal Code including but not limited to parking, lighting, landscaping, etc.
16. All areas not used for structures, parking, driveways, walkways, or other hardscape shall be landscaped and maintained by the property owner per Section 17.92.030(A)(1) of the Lathrop Municipal Code to the satisfaction of the City.
17. The applicant shall submit appropriate plans to the Community Development Department for plan check and building permit. Final site plan, elevation, landscaping and irrigation, exterior lighting and site improvement plans and details, etc. shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division. Any significant change or modification to the approved plan is subject to review and approval by the Community Development Director.
18. Landscaping and irrigation must be consistent with the City's Water Conservation Requirements (LMC 17.92.060) and the State Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (AB 1881). The applicant shall include with the landscape and irrigation plan a water efficient landscape worksheet with water budget calculations identifying the water allowance and estimated water use.
19. The applicant/property owner shall ensure the entire site including landscaping areas shall be maintained in a healthy, weed free condition to the satisfaction of the City.
20. Trash enclosure(s) shall include but not be limited to a covered roof, metal gate and have three solid walls. Details and/or alternative designs or location shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning, Building, and Public Works Department. The trash enclosure design, material and color shall match or compliment the main building.
21. It shall be the responsibility of the applicant/property owner to ensure that any building or parking area lighting including security lighting associated with the project, be arranged so as to not cast light onto adjoining properties.
22. A final site lighting photometric plan with detailed specifications of all lighting fixtures, poles, and wall packs as well as a manufacture's catalog sheet containing photometric data, shall be submitted with Building Permits for City review and approval. Parking lots, driveways, trash enclosure/areas shall be illuminated during the hours of darkness with a minimum maintained one foot-candle of light and an average not to exceed four foot-candles of light. The illumination shall not exceed ten (10) foot-candles in any one location.
23. No signs are approved for this project. A Master Sign Program for the project shall be prepared and submitted for review and approval by the Planning Division per Chapter 17.84 of the Zoning Code. All signs shall require a Planning Division Sign Design application and a separate Building Permit application, subject to review and approval of the Planning and Building Divisions.
24. Bicycle parking shall be installed consistent with Chapter 17.76 .120 of the LMC. In accordance with LMC Section 17.76.120(D), the proposed project shall provide changing facilities for employees/workers utilizing bicycle to get to and from the use and bicycle lockers in a secure room equal to the minimum number of bicycle parking stalls required by Chapter 17.76. Bicycle lockers should be in close proximity to the employee entrance. The final location(s) shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division. The secure room shall include electrical outlets for the purpose of charging electric bicycles (e-bikes).
25. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened and not visible from the public right-ofway. Screening materials shall be compatible with the architectural style, materials and color of the building upon which the equipment is located, subject to the approval of the Community Development Director or designee.
26. Ground-mounted equipment that is not required to be visible, shall be screened not visible from the public right-of-way using the most practical means of screening, such as landscaping, a freestanding wall/fence, matching paint, subject to approval of the Community Development Director or designee.
27. Unless otherwise specified, all conditions of approval shall be complied with prior to the issuance of any Building Permits.
28. The Site Plan shall expire thirty-six (36) months from the date of approval unless a time extension is granted consistent with the policies and procedure of the Lathrop Municipal Code. Prior to the expiration date of August 30, 2026 a building permit must be issued and construction commenced and diligently pursued toward completion of the site or structures.
29. In the event clarification is required for an interpretation of these Conditions of Approval, the Community Development Director and City Engineer shall have the authority either to administratively clarify the intent and wording of these Conditions of Approval without the requirement of a public hearing or to refer questions regarding the interpretation of these Conditions of Approval to the Planning Commission. If the applicant take issue with the clarification provided administratively, the applicant shall have the right to appeal the administrative clarification to the Planning Commission. The Community Development Director and City Engineer shall also have the authority to make minor modifications to these conditions provided a request is made in writing by the applicant and it is determined such modifications are consistent with and in furtherance of the underlying intent of the condition being modified.
30. The City of Lathrop may conduct annual and or spot inspections to ensure that compliance with the required site improvements and conditions are being maintained.
31. The applicant shall install an eight (8) foot high chain link fence with vinyl privacy slats (black powder coated) along the western property line to screen the outdoor storage areas.

## BUILDING

1. All construction associated with this project shall comply with the most recent adopted City and State building codes.
2. Special Inspections - As indicated by California Building Code Section 1704, the property owner/developer shall employ one or more special inspectors who shall provide special inspections when required by CBC section 1704. The property owner/developer shall contact the Building Department at time of plan submittal to obtain application for special inspections.
3. The Title Sheet of the plans shall include:

Occupancy Group Type of Construction
Occupant Load Height of Building Description of Use Floor area of building(s) by occupancy group Area Analysis Code Used
4. The property owner/developer shall be responsible for payment of school impact fees prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. Dimensioned building setbacks and property lines, street centerlines and distances between buildings and structures shall be provided on the project site plan.
6. The project shall be designed to conform with energy conservation measures articulated in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and address measures to reduce energy consumption such as flow restrictors for toilets, low consumption light fixtures, and insulation and shall use to the extent feasible draught landscaping.
7. All property lines and easements shall be shown on the site plan. A statement shall be provided that indicates such lines and easements are shown is required.
8. Public and private site improvements shall be designed in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Chapter 11 of the California Building Code. The site plan shall include a site accessibility plan identifying exterior routes of travel and detailing running slope, cross slope, width, pedestrian ramp, curb ramps, handrails, signage and truncated domes. The path of travel shall be provided from the public right of way and accessible parking to building. The design professional shall ensure that the site accessibility plan is in compliance with the latest Federal and State regulations. A site accessibility plan shall be required per the attached policy from the link below: https://www.ci.lathrop.ca.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/building_division/page/24708/site_ accessibility_plan_requirements.pdf
9. At the time of building permit application submittal a design professional shall be required to prepare the formal construction plans for proposed improvements per the Business and Professions' Code.
10. Grading and Site Improvement permits from Public Works may be required separately from the accessibility plan in compliance with item 8.

## PUBLIC WORKS

## Land

1. The applicant shall dedicate all right-of-way (ROW) necessary for the ultimate ROW width as represented in the approved Improvement Plans. A 10 -foot public utility easement (PUE) shall also be dedicated along all ROW frontages.

## Public/Frontage Improvements

1. The applicant shall submit an encroachment permit for all work within the public right-of-way and City owned or controlled property.
2. The applicant shall be required to install full street frontage improvements along all frontages of the parcel being developed or improved. Frontage improvements shall include but are not limited to curb, gutter, sidewalk, street lights, hydrants, asphalt concrete paving, striping, driveways, and landscaping. The extent of paving shall include one-half ultimate street width or as otherwise stated in the City of Lathrop Municipal Code. The applicant shall submit the off-site plans for approval along with the applicable plan check and inspection fees.
3. The applicant shall underground all existing and new overhead utilities on both sides of the frontage street in compliance with the Lathrop Municipal Code. Overhead power lines in excess of 34.5 KVA are not required to be undergrounded.
4. As recommended in the TJKM Traffic Impact Analysis Report, the applicant shall complete the following improvements prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, including a temporary certificate of occupancy:
a. Lathrop Road/I-5 SB Ramps: Optimize signal timing to achieve an acceptable level of service. Align signal timing with coordination plan for the Lathrop Road corridor.
b. Golden Valley Parkway \& Spartan Way/Lathrop Road Intersection: Grind existing striping, slurry seal extents of striping and restripe the following configuration to City Standards:
i. NB Approach: One left-turn lane, one through lane, two right-turn lanes
ii. SB Approach: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, one right-turn lane
iii. EB Approach: One left turn-lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane
iv. WB Approach: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, one right-turn lane
5. The TJKM Traffic Impact Analysis Report found that the Lathrop Road/I-5 NB Ramp will degrade from LOS E to LOS F with the Project in the Baseline plus Project condition, which will require the construction of a 400 foot separate right turn lane on the NB Ramp. The applicant shall conduct current traffic counts for the NB Ramp to confirm the baseline condition and complete a technical memorandum to document the findings of the traffic counts. If the results of the technical memorandum indicate that the impact is negligible or that the level of service does not degrade below LOS D in the Current Baseline plus Project condition, the project shall not be required to construct the 400 foot separate right turn lane on the NB Ramp. If the results of the traffic counts indicate that the project operations would cause the LOS to degrade below a LOS D with the Project, the applicant shall be required to construct the 400 foot separate right turn lane on the NB Ramp. If the improvements are required, applicant shall design, estimate construction cost and provide performance and labor \& materials guarantee to the City for the improvements and enter into a deferred frontage improvement agreement with the City prior to issuance of a building permit for the Project. If required, the applicant shall work towards construction of the improvements in a timely manner for completion as close to the occupancy of the Project as possible.
6. The applicant shall be required to improve Golden Valley Parkway from Spartan Way to Dos Reis Road. Golden Valley Parkway is currently improved from Spartan Way to about 240 feet south of Does Reis Road and includes utilities, curb \& gutter, and bottom lift pavement and subgrade. The applicant shall be required to complete the improvements on Golden Valley Parkway to include but not limited to sidewalk, top lift pavement, striping, signing, landscaping and lighting. The improvements are eligible in part for City Transportation Capital Facility Fee (CFF) credit or reimbursement as portions are included in the existing City CFF program and this roadway provides a regional benefit.
7. The applicant shall be required to construct a roundabout at the intersection of Golden Valley Parkway and Dos Reis Road. The roundabout shall be an enhanced gateway to the CLSP Phase 2 area and shall include components such as monumentation, art, enhanced landscaping, lighting, etc. The roundabout shall include safety improvements such as pedestrian actuated flashing warning signs. The final design shall be approved by the City Engineer. The applicant shall submit the roundabout plans for approval as part of the offsite improvement plans.
8. The applicant shall be required to abandon and barricade Manthey Road between Lathrop Road and Dos Reis Road upon completion of the improvement of Golden Valley Parkway. This abandonment is necessary to facility the proper traffic circulation for the project.
9. The applicant shall be required to install signage on Lathrop Road, Spartan Way, Golden Valley Parkway, Dos Reis Road and Manthey Road south of Dos Reis Road prohibiting trucks from utilizing these roadways. Location and size of the signage shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.
10. Applicant shall comply with Chapter 10.16, Truck Routes and Commercial Vehicles of the LMC.
11. The applicant shall construct a raised "pork chop" with bollards at the northeast corner of Spartan Way and Golden Valley Parkway to discourage semi-trucks from making a right-turn towards the Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) Phase 2 area. The design of the improvements shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and must be installed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
12. The applicant shall construct a raised median on S. Manthey Road adjacent to the truck driveway at the facility to discourage trucks from making a left turn in and a right turn out of the facility. The design of the improvements shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and must be installed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

## Wastewater

1. The applicant shall be required to connect to the City sewer system prior to certificate of occupancy for the first building within the project.
2. The applicant shall secure sufficient sewer capacity for the project and pay all connection fees and reimbursements.
3. The project will connect to the existing Central Lathrop Phase 1 gravity sewer main system and the wastewater will be conveyed to the City's Treatment Plan by use of the existing Central Lathrop Phase 1 wastewater pump station and force mains. The applicant shall provide calculations to the City Engineer proving that these existing facilities can support the additional wastewater discharge from the project and shall install any improvements needed to accommodate the project if the existing facilities are deficient.

## Potable Water

1. The applicant shall be required to connect to the water utility for domestic supply prior to certificate of occupancy and pay all applicable connection fees. All existing groundwater wells on site shall be abandoned under a permit from San Joaquin County prior to connecting potable water to the site.
2. The applicant shall secure sufficient water capacity for the project and pay all connection fees and reimbursements.
3. The project will connect to the existing Central Lathrop Phase 1 potable water system. The applicant shall provide calculations to the City Engineer proving that these existing facilities can support the projects needs and shall install any improvements needed to accommodate the project if the existing facilities are deficient.

## Recycled Water

1. Applicant shall install recycled water mains along all frontages if not existing. All public landscaping shall be irrigated with recycled water and a recycled water hydrant shall be placed in an accessible location along the frontage to provide a filling station for street sweeping activities and construction.
2. All recycled water points of connection for irrigation require the installation of a recycled water meter.

## Storm Drain

1. The applicant shall be required to connect to storm drain utility and pay all applicable connection fees.
2. Hydrology and hydraulic calculations and plans for on-site and off-site storm drainage systems shall be submitted to the City for review and approval.
3. As part of their onsite improvements, the applicant shall install all necessary Best Management Practices (BMP's) for post construction in accordance with City guidelines and standards. The BMP's must be in place prior to final occupancy for the project.
4. The applicant shall execute a maintenance agreement for all onsite storm water quality treatment devices, swales, and/or ponds.
5. The project will connect to the existing Central Lathrop Phase 1 storm water system for Watershed 4. The applicant shall provide calculations to the City Engineer proving that these existing facilities can support the projects needs and shall install any improvements needed to accommodate the project if the existing facilities are deficient.

## General

1. The applicant shall retain the services of a California licensed civil engineer to design the project utility plans for sewer, water, storm drain lines and systems.
2. The applicant shall ensure that all off-site and on-site improvements comply with City Standards as illustrated on the approved Improvement Plans.
3. All on-site water, sewer, and storm drain systems that are privately owned shall be maintained by the property owner.
4. The parking areas and drive aisles on site shall be paved with asphalt concrete.
5. The project shall comply with the Multi-Agency Post Construction Storm Water Manual.
6. Grading and other construction activities that may cause dust shall be watered to control dust at the City Engineer's direction. A water vehicle shall be available eon site for dust control operations at all times during grading operations. The adjacent public street shall be kept free and clean of any project dirt, mud, materials, and debris.
7. The applicant shall pay all appropriate fees including, but not limited to, North Lathrop Transportation Fee, Levee Impact Fee, Capital Facilities Fees, and Plan Check and Inspection Fees.
8. A geotechnical report shall be submitted for the project, which includes groundwater elevations, percolation rates for retention basins, soil compaction requirements, and recommendations for asphalt paving and concrete. Building PAD certification is required from Geotechnical Engineer and/or Special Inspector.
9. All water meters shall be installed within the public right of way or public utility easement. The City shall not be the responsible party for maintaining water and sewer lines beyond existing main line stub outs or on private property, unless otherwise agreed to by the City.
10. The applicant has the option to enter into a reimbursement agreement with the City for construction cost reimbursement of any infrastructure that provides regional benefit.
11. All improvements shall be designed and constructed per the most current City Standards.
12. The applicant shall create or participate in a Community Facilities District (CFD) to fund the maintenance of all public infrastructure prior to issuance of the first building permit associated with the project.
13. If the project is greater than one acre; the applicant shall complete a SWPPP, obtain a WDID number and list the number on the improvement plans, and submit the SWPPP to the City for review and approval.

## LATHROP-MANTECA FIRE DISTRICT (LMFD)

1. The project shall conform to the most currently adopted edition of the California Fire Code and all related standards.
2. Permits shall be obtained from the fire code official. Permit(s) and fees, shall be paid prior to issuance of any and/or all permits. Issued permits shall be kept on the premises designated therein at all times and shall be readily available for inspection by the fire code official. (Permits are to be renewed on an annual basis).
3. Depending on the proposed Occupancy Type \& fire area occupant load, Automatic Fire Sprinklers may be required. In the case where automatic fire sprinkler systems are required, such systems shall comply with California Fire Code Section 903.2 and the Tenant/Occupant/Owner shall have the responsibility to ensure that the correct fire suppressions system is added/modified/tested and accepted by the (AHJ) Fire District for review and approval prior to modification. Deferred submittal accepted.
4. All residential structures shall be Fire Sprinkler protected, as per the City of Lathrop's Fire Sprinkler Ordinance, California Fire Code, California Residential Code, and the California Building Standards Codes. Fire suppression system plans shall be modified under separate fire permit and shall be submitted by a licensed fire contractor, to the (AHJ) Fire District for review and approval prior installation. Deferred plan submittals are accepted.
5. Fire Sprinkler System alterations and plans shall be submitted directly to LMFD.
6. Fire Alarm System upgrades and plans shall be submitted directly to LMFD.
7. A means of Ingress and Egress Plan shall be submitted with the project Tenant Improvement Plans.
8. An approved fire alarm system shall be installed in accordance with CFC $\S 907.2$ and NFPA 72.
9. Fire Department Development Impact Fees for all new buildings shall be paid in accordance with the City of Lathrop Municipal Code and Resolutions of the adopted fee schedule.
10. An approved Fire Flow test shall be conducted prior to ground breaking to determine allowable Fire Fighting capabilities for the site.
11. An approved water supply for fire protection, either temporary or permanent, shall be made available prior to commencing construction beyond the foundation stage, or as soon as combustible material arrives on the site.
12. Deferred Plan Submittals for Fire Alarm, Fire Sprinklers and Fire Underground shall be submitted directly to LMFD.
13. Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be surfaced so as to provide all-weather driving capabilities. Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet ( 6096 mm ), exclusive of shoulders, except for approved security gates in accordance with California Fire Code (CFC) Section 503.6, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches ( 4115 mm ). Adequate turnaround shall be provided per City of Lathrop Standards and Appendix D of the 2022 CFC.
14. Where access to the development is restricted because of secured openings or where immediate access is necessary for life-saving or fire-fighting purposes, a key "knox" box is required to be installed in an approved location. The key "knox" box shall be of an approved type and shall contain keys to gain necessary access as required by the fire code official. In addition to key "knox" box(es), any automatic gates shall have Opticom access ability to provide necessary access for emergency apparatus.
15. Where a portion of the added street is constructed more than 200 feet ( 61 meters) from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route, the developer shall provide an additional fire hydrant and main shall be provided. NOTE: The developer shall provide exact locations and distances of existing hydrants in the area. (CFC Appendix C, and City of Lathrop Water System Standards).
16. The developer shall be responsible for providing approved vehicle access for firefighting to all construction and demolition sites. Vehicle access shall be provided to within 100 feet ( 30,480 mm ) of temporary or permanent fire department connections. Vehicle access shall be provided by either temporary or permanent roads, capable of supporting vehicle loading under all weather conditions. Vehicle access shall be maintained until permanent fire apparatus access roads are available.
17. The Fire Department Fire Access Roads shall meet the requirements established by the San Joaquin County Fire Chief's Association.
18. The turning radius for his project shall be a minimum of 41 feet for all Emergency Fire Apparatus.
19. Buildings exceed 30 feet in height shall have a minimum unobstructed fire apparatus access width of 26 feet.
20. Commercial cooking equipment that produce grease laden vapors shall be provided with a Type I Hood, in accordance with the California Mechanical Code, and automatic fire extinguishing system that is listed and labeled for its intended use as follows:
a. Wet chemical extinguishing system, complying with UL 300
b. Carbon dioxide extinguishing systems
c. Automatic fire sprinkler systems
21. Where a portion of the facility or building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction is more than 400 feet ( 122 meters) from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site fire hydrants and mains shall be provided where required by the fire code official.
22. At LMFD`s discretion the proposed project may be subject to other fire \& life safety requirements at the time of building plan review.
23. Final approval is subject to field inspections. A minimum 48 to 72 -hour notice is required prior to any life-safety fire inspections. Other conditions may apply at time of inspections and are subject to correction.

## LATHROP POLICE DEPARTMENT (LPD)

1. The applicant shall paint the address on the roof top for each individual building. The numbers shall be at least 3 feet tall, 2 feet wide, 9 inches apart, with 6 -inch brush stroke with a color that contrast the roof top, top of numbers/letters should point north.
2. The applicant shall install dedicated lights in the parking lot that are properly maintained including the drive access.
3. The applicant shall install an indoor and outdoor recording security camera system that shall be maintained by the property owner and accessible to LPD with camera views covering all ingress and egress to all building(s) and parking areas. The quantity and location shall be reviewed and approved by LPD prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.
4. Where access to the development is restricted because of secured openings or where immediate access is necessary for life-saving or emergency purposes, a key "knox" box is required to be installed in an approved location. The key "knox" box shall be of an approved type and shall contain keys to gain necessary access as required by the police chief. In addition to key "knox" box(es), any automatic gates shall have Opticom access ability to provide necessary access for emergency vehicles.
5. The proposed landscaping for this project shall conform to the following CPTED measurements:
a. Maintain natural visible surveillance to building from parking lot and street.
b. Plants taller than 8 feet shall be trimmed up to 4 feet from ground.
c. Plans under 8 feet shall be trimmed to allow ground level surveillance.

## ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

1. By exercising this approval, the applicant hereby agrees to indemnify, hold harmless and defend the City, its officers, agents, elected and appointed officials, and employees, from any and all liability or claims that may be brought against the City arising out of its approval of this Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit to the fullest extent permitted by law.

## SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT

See attached memorandum dated June 21, 2023.

# Environmental Health Department 

Jasjit Kang, REHS, Director
Munlappe Nedidu, RERS. Aesisene Director
PROGRAM COOROINATORS
Jev Carnusco, REHS, RDI
W解YMg KEHS Siewn Sthi, REHS Simun Shih, REHS
Elana Manzo. REHS Nataka Subtoonikova REHS
June 21. 2023

| To: | City of Lathrop Community Development Department Planning Division <br> Attention David Niskanen |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Cesar Ruvalcaba (209) 953-6213 <br> Lead Senior Registered Environmental Health Specialist |
| RE: | CUP-23-08, SPR-23-09, Referral, SU0015642, SU0015641 <br> $14101 ~ S . ~ M a n t h e y ~ R o a d ~(A P N: ~ 192-020-14) ~$ |

The San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department (EHD) recommends the following conditions as a part of developing this project:

1. Any geotechnical drilling shall be conducted under permit and inspection by The Environmental Health Department (San Joaquin County Development Title. Section 9601.010(b) and 9-601.020(i)).
2. Any abandoned wells or septic systems shall be destroyed under permit and inspection by the EHD (San Joaquin County Development Titte, Section 9-605.010 \& 9-601.020)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
SUMMARY OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS
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## Summary of CEQA Project Requirements for the Ashley Warehouse Project

Requirement AG-1: Implement Lathrop Municipal Code Chapter 3.40 AGRICULTURAL MITIGATION FEE Section 3.40.030 Collection of Agricultural Mitigation Fee.

The Agricultural Mitigation Fee enacted pursuant to this chapter is to be collected by the city before the issuance of building permits, or at approval of any discretionary permit if no building permit is required. (Ord. 05-248 § 1)

Requirement AG-2: Require all development to coordinate with and participate with SJCOG in the SJMSCP Agricultural Mitigation Fee program as required.

Requirement AQ-1: Comply with SJVAPCD Rule 9510 Indirect Source Review
Requirement AQ-2: Comply with SSJVAPCD Regulation VIII for all sites and implementation control measures indicated in Tables 6-2 and 6-3 of the SJVAPCD's Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts.
Requirement BIO-1: Compliance with the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP)

Requirement BIO-2: Compliance with the mitigation recommendations included within Biological Resources Analysis Report (Attachment A).

- VELB Buffer and/or Survey - VELB is a species covered by the SJMSCP (SJCOG 2000), and the incidental take minimization and mitigation measures outlined in the document are as follows:
"In areas with elderberry bushes, as indicated by the SJMSCP Vegetation Maps or per a preconstruction survey identification or other sources indicated in Section 5.2.2.3, the following shall occur:
A. If elderberry shrubs are present on the project site, a setback of 20 feet from the dripline of each elderberry bush shall be established.
B. Brightly colored flags or fencing shall be placed surrounding elderberry shrubs throughout the construction process.
C. For all shrubs without evidence of VELB exit holes which cannot be retained on the project site as described in A and B, above, the JPA shall, during preconstruction surveys, count all stems of 1 " or greater in diameter at ground level. Compensation for removal of these stems shall be provided by the JPA within SJMSCP Preserves as provided in SJMSCP Section 5.5.4(B).
D. For all shrubs with evidence of VELB exit holes, the JPA shall undertake transplanting of elderberry shrubs displaying evidence of VELB occupation to VELB mitigation sites during the dormant period for elderberry shrubs (November 1 - February 15). For elderberry shrubs displaying evidence of VELB occupation which cannot be transplanted, compensation for removal of shrubs shall be as provided in SJMSCP Section 5.5.4 (C)."
If the elderberry shrub can be maintained on the project site, then a 20 ft . setback will need to be established around the shrub (See Figure 11). If the shrub cannot be maintained on the project site, then VELB exit hole surveys consistent with the USFWS protocol (USFWS 2017) will be performed prior to any ground disturbance. Depending on the results of this survey, either mitigation measure $C$ or $D$ above will be used.
- Pre-construction Reptile Survey - Both California glossy snake and San Joaquin coachwhip have a low potential to occur on the Property and therefor a pre-construction survey should be performed no more than 48 hours prior to ground disturbance or vegetation removal. Surveys would be required to determine presence/absence of this species. If the species are found to occur on the project site, then passive relocation methods should be attempted before ground disturbance.
- Pre-Construction Avian Survey - If project construction-related activities would take place during the nesting season (February through August), preconstruction surveys for nesting passerine birds and raptors (birds of prey) in large trees adjacent to the project site should be conducted by a competent biologist 14 days prior to the commencement of the tree removal or site grading activities. Specific attention should be paid to the active Swainson's hawk nest that was identified across Dos Reis Road from the project site. As per the Incidental Take Minimization Measures for Swainson's hawk that are outlined in Section 5.2.4.11 of the SJMSCP (SJCOG 2000):
"If a nest tree becomes occupied during construction activities, then all construction activities shall remain a distance of two times the dripline of the tree, measured from the nest."

The dripline for the tree where the Swainson's hawk nest was observed is estimated to be 25 feet, making the required buffer for this nest 50 feet. The nest location and buffer are shown in Figure 11.
If any other birds listed under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act are found to be nesting within the project site or within the area of influence, an adequate protective buffer zone should be established by a qualified biologist to protect the nesting site. This buffer shall be a minimum of 50 feet from the project activities for passerine birds, and a minimum of 250 feet for other raptors. The distance shall be determined by a competent biologist based on the site conditions (topography, if the nest is in a line of sight of the construction and the sensitivity of the birds nesting). The nest site(s) shall be monitored by a competent biologist periodically to see if the birds are stressed by the construction activities and if the protective buffer needs to be increased. Once the young have fledged and are flying well enough to avoid project construction zones (typically by August), the project can proceed without further regard to the nest site(s).

- Burrowing Owl Surveys - Burrowing owls were not identified on the project site during May 2021 survey. However, a burrowing owl pre-construction survey should take place before any construction activities commence. It is recommended that they be conducted whenever burrowing owl habitat or sign is encountered on or adjacent to (within 150 meters) a project site. Occupancy of burrowing owl habitat is confirmed at a site when at least one burrowing owl or its sign at or near a burrow entrance is observed within the last three years. If a burrowing owl or sign is present on the project site three additional protocol level surveys will be initiated. As per the incidental take minimization and mitigation measures outlined in the SJMSCO (SJCOG 2000): If burrowing owls are identified and work is to commence during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31), then the owls should be evicted from the project site by passive relocation as described in the CDFW's report on burrowing owls (1995). If work occurs during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31) then the burrows shall not be disturbed and will be provided with a 75 -meter protective buffer. However, if it is determined that the birds have not begun laying eggs, or the juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival, then the burrows can be destroyed.
- Erosion Control - Grading and excavation activities could expose soil to increased rates of erosion during construction periods. During construction, runoff from the warehouse site could adversely surrounding habitats and cause increased particulate matter to enter the storm drain system. Implementation of appropriate mitigation measures would ensure that impacts to aquatic systems would be avoided or minimized. Mitigation measures may include best management practices (BMP's) such as hay bales, silt fencing, placement of straw mulch and hydro seeding of exposed soils after construction as identified in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).


## Requirement CUL-1: Implement General Plan Action: RR $3 b$

RR-3b: Require all new development, infrastructure, and other ground-disturbing projects to comply with the following conditions in the event of an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources or human remains:
A. If construction or grading activities result in the discovery of significant historic or prehistoric archaeological artifacts or unique paleontological resources, all work within 100 feet of the discovery shall cease, the Community Development Director shall be notified, the resources shall be examined by a qualified archaeologist, paleontologist, or historian for appropriate protection and preservation measures; and work may only resume when appropriate protections are in place and have been approved by the Community Development Director; and
B. If human remains are discovered during any ground disturbing activity, work shall stop until the Community Development Director and the San Joaquin County Coroner have been contacted. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission and the most likely descendants shall be consulted; and work may only resume when appropriate measures have been taken and approved by the Community Development Director.

Requirement GEO-1: Implement recommendations presented in the Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report. Prepared by: Terracon Consultants, Inc. during the project design and construction.

Requirement HAZ-1: If the project will store, transport or handle hazardous materials the project shall be required to prepare and file a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) with the City prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.
Project Requirement Hydro-1: The project applicant shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes specific types and sources of stormwater pollutants, determine the location and nature of potential impacts, and specify appropriate control measures to eliminate impacts on receiving water quality from stormwater runoff. The SWPPP shall require treatment BMPS that incorporate, at a minimum, the required hydraulic sizing design criteria for volume and flow to treat projected stormwater runoff. The SWPPP shall comply with the most current standards established by the RWQCB, and the Lathrop Storm Water Program. Best Management Practices shall be subject to approval by the City Engineer and RWQCB.

Project Requirement Hydro 2: Prior to approval of the building permit, the project applicant shall submit a detailed Stormwater Control Plan constant with General Plan Action PFS-4.5, and the criteria set forth in the Lathrop Stormwater Program.

Requirement N-1: Implement General Plan Policy N-1.15, and Lathrop Municipal Code Section 8.20.110 (Construction of buildings and projects).

N-1.15 Construction Noise. Require construction activities to reduce noise impacts on adjacent uses to the criteria identified in Table $N-3$, or, if the criteria cannot be met, to the maximum extent feasible complying with Title 15 of the LMC (Building and Construction) and use best practices. Construction activities outside of the permitted construction hours identified in the LMC may be approved on a case-bycase basis by the Building Official.

Lathrop Municipal Code Section 8.20.110 (Construction of buildings and projects) "It shall be unlawful for any person within a residential zone or within a radius of five hundred (500) feet therefrom, to operate equipment or perform any outside construction or repair work on buildings, structures or projects or to operate any pile driver, power shovel, pneumatic hammer, derrick, power hoist, or any other construction type device between the hours of ten p.m. of one day and seven a.m. of the next day, or eleven p.m. and nine a.m. Fridays, Saturdays and legal holidays, in such a manner that a reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area is caused discomfort or annoyance unless beforehand a permit therefore has been duly obtained from the office or body of the city having the function to issue permits of this kind. No permit shall be required to perform emergency work as defined in Sections 8.20.010 through 8.20.040. (Prior code § 99.40)"

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS

I have read, understand and acknowledge the Conditions of Approval dated ..... 9/13/2023the Ashley Furniture Project.
CaswrbhSignature of Applicants)Aaron HodgdonPrint Applicants) Name9/6/2023
Date
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 PROJECT SPECIFIC SITE PLAN REVIEW APPROVAL
## Development Team

| Applicant | Hodgdon Management and Construction, Inc. <br> 1461 E Cooley Dr, Ste 230 <br> Colton, CA 92324 |
| :---: | :--- |
| Developer | Hodgdon Management and Construction, Inc. <br> 1461 E Cooley Dr, Ste 230 <br> Colton, CA 92324 |
| Architect | HPA Architects <br> 18831 Bardeen Ave <br> Irvine, CA 92612 |
| Civil Engineer/Landscape | MacKay \& Somps <br> 5142 Franklin Dr, STE B <br> Pleasanton, CA 94588 |
| Traffic Engineer | TJKM <br> 4305 Hacienda Dr, STE 550 <br> Pleasanton, CA 94588 |
| Acoustical Consultant - Noise | Saxelby Acoustics <br> Assessment |
| CEQA Highland Pointe Drive, STE 250 <br> Roseville, CA 95678 |  |
| Health Risk Assessment | De Novo Planning <br> 1020 Suncast In, \#106 <br> El Dorado Hills, CA 95762 |
|  |  |
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# ASHLEY FURNITURE Project Specific Site Plan Review Approval Narrative 

## A. Request and Property Description

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit for the development of a new integrated, high-quality warehouse/light industrial/retail office development on approximately 89.5 -acre property located at the northwest corner of Dos Reis Rd and Manthey Road (the "Property"). The proposed development will support the expansion needs of an international company specializing in uses that include light-industrial, warehouse and distribution, office, and retail sales of targeted bulk consumer goods.

The 2022 Lathrop General Plan Update designates the Property within an industrial area in the Central Lathrop Phase II area. The City of Lathrop is currently processing the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase II amendment and rezoning to implement the new General Plan Update designation for this area. The Property was formerly agricultural but now currently fallow. The Property is bound by fallow agricultural land directly to the north and De Lima Rd \& Manthey Rd and Interstate 5 freeway to the east. The Property's western boundary is vacant, fallow agricultural land and the south boundary is Dos Reis Rd adjacent to vacant commercially zoned land and mixed vacant land and commercial/residential.

## B. Project Description

The proposed development includes an approximately $1,486,607$ square foot single or multi-tenant building with a mix of retail, office/call center, and warehouse and distribution uses (the "Project").

The Project is anticipated to be an attractive, high-quality development that will provide substantial employment opportunities within the City of Lathrop, including up to 500 diverse jobs at full operation.

The Project consists of a single building, with a mix of tenant-related uses. The primary mix of uses within the Project building include an up to 100,000 square foot retail showroom, a 24,000 square foot, 2-3 story office space consisting of call center and a regional office for up to 50 people. Warehouse and distribution uses will comprise the balance of the $1,352,347$ square feet. The proposed building's height is approximately 50 feet, with architectural features that may extend to approximately 60 feet.

Vehicular \& Truck access to the Property is proposed via four (4) access drives; one (1) access drive on Manthey Rd at the far northeast corner is dedicated for truck ingress/egress onto and from the Project. One (1) public and employee vehicular access mid-block on Manthey Rd is proposed for ingress/egress of the public and employees' access to the retail and office. Two (2) additional access points are
proposed along Dos Reis Rd with the most eastern access proposed for public vehicular access to the retail and customer pick-up areas located at the southeast corner of the building. A fourth and final access is closed to the public and trucks and is reserved only for emergency vehicle access. Per the Traffic Impact Analysis completed by TJKM as a part of the Site Design Review package approval the project is expected to generate 680 daily truck trips including 95 a.m. peak hour trips and 45 p.m. peak hour trips.

The developer will widen Dos Reis Road and Manthey Road to their ultimate condition and compliant with the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment (CLSP 2). Landscape and sidewalk improvements beyond the back of curb along the southern portion of Dos Reis Road will be constructed by future developers of the adjacent properties.

Per the Traffic Impact Analysis completed by TJKM as a part of the Site Design Review package approval the project is expected to generate 680 daily truck trips including 95 a.m. peak hour trips and 45 p.m. peak hour trips.

Once customers are on site, internal circulation roads will route them to the retail entrance in the center of the building. For furniture pick up, customers are directed to a separate waiting area labeled on the plan as "Customer Pick-up", ("CPU") located on the southeast corner of the building where customers will be guided to the CPU office and their pickup location.

Hours of operation will vary among the distribution, call center, and retail portions of the development. Retail hours are anticipated to align with the typical store hours of other Ashley Furniture locations in the Bay Area, running from 9:00 am to 9:00 pm 7 days a week. However, these hours are subject to change with final design.

The call and distribution centers are expected to have a broader range of operating hours, accommodating several shift changes throughout the day to ensure efficient operations. The specific number of shifts and their timeframes will be determined during the final design phase, considering operational requirements and workforce needs.

During final design, more detailed information regarding the hours of operations, the number of shifts, days of operation and the specific timeframes of shifts will be provided.

## C. Permitted Uses

I. Permitted land uses for the Project include:

1. Call center
2. General retail sales
3. Office
4. Outdoor trailer parking
5. Outdoor storage associated with an on-site primary use, excluding vehicles
6. Sale of products including those assembled on-site as well as imported product
7. Retail showroom
8. Warehousing and Distribution

## D. Site Details

## I. Lighting

Light levels are not to exceed 1-foot candle at the property line. All proposed site lighting will comply with city zoning requirements.

## II. Screening

The project proposes a 30 -foot landscape buffer along the Dos Reis Road project frontage, in accordance with the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment (CLSP 2). To further enhance screening for trailer parking areas, an 8 -foot-tall community wall is proposed along the right-of-way of Dos Reis Road at the project frontage. Additionally, the project proposes an increased number of deciduous trees between the 8 -foot paved sidewalk and the 8 -foot-tall community wall. This condition will extend along the south boundary of the property until the first driveway east of the proposed Dos Reis Road and Golden Valley Parkway roundabout. Proceeding north along Manthey Road, the tree spacing, and landscape design will transition to a less dense arrangement typically found in retail areas.

## III. Air Quality Best Management Practices

The project demonstrates compliance with the City of Lathrop General Plan Best Management Practices, as outlined in Implementation Action LU-5. d. The following measures have been implemented to align with these practices:

- The 30-foot landscape buffer described in section D.ll provides a physical and structural buffer between possible sensitive receptors and the warehouse/trailer parking area.
- Sufficient onsite parking and queuing locations have been included in the project site plan, accommodating multiple truck lengths. This design ensures that trucks do not idle within public right-of-way.
- The project site plan is designed so that truck ingress/egress is largely isolated to the most Northeastern corner of the development along Manthey Road.
- Generous setbacks have been incorporated between loading docks and property lines.
- In areas where trailer parking is present, a community wall has been strategically placed along visible sections of right-of-way and property lines to screen views.
- Wayfinding signs have been specifically designed and positioned at truck ingress/egress locations, clearly indicating that truck traffic is restricted to Roth Road only.


## IV. Walls \& Fences

See Screen Wall \& Fencing Plan; Sheet DAB-A4.2

## V. Parking Standards

On-site parking for the Project shall be provided in accordance with Table 1 below:

## Table 1

| 2rimass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W. ${ }^{1}$ | 3767820 | * |
| maxies | 8650 | * |
| 2tinuons |  |  |
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| Ofice - 2mathor | 8000 | $s{ }^{1}$ |
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|  | 35190 | s: |
| Wwerase | 1352347 | 1: |
| rotal | 1466803 | s* |
| AUTOPARMor memune |  |  |
| Offee 1400: | 69 | 56\% |
| Hetet ; 600 s: | 184 | tur |
| Whase 1,2000 : | 676 | that |
| rotal | 920 | th |
| Autopargmo provirs |  |  |
| Stamsera: 9\% 23: | 342 | tas |
| TOTAL | 912 | tals |
|  |  |  |
| Sxandmat Acsess cie is isix: | $: 5$ | mak |
| Vanacsenste : 17 I 2001 | 4 | stans |
| Totul | 20 | staus |
| Equtodevomaxima |  |  |
| EV cioas spare: $9 \times 20$, | 144 | stans |
| EvCS Standara: $9 \times 25$ : ..... | 49 | sum |
| Toxat EvCasaso Same | 188 | stons |
| ADA EV Parimgicac rabie 1 16.7383711 |  |  |
| EvCs von Actessole i 2 rax : | 1 | stans |
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| Var Accenste ; $12 \times 120$, | 6 | stans |
|  | 145 | 15* |
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## E. Architectural Design

The architectural character of the development will have a high-tech contemporary appearance. This will be established using clean edges and forms, and colors. The development's east elevation, facing Manthey Rd \& Interstate 5, will convey a high-quality office/retail appearance while maintaining key functions, including customer pick-up areas along the southeast elevation. This is achieved with glazing to indicate an office appearance and clerestory windows along the upper portions of the façade. Please refer to the conceptual building elevations on Sheet DAB-A3.3.

The conceptual building elevations include strong architectural forms and distinct design elements, such as accent shading features, variations in parapet height and colors. Collectively these provide for enhanced visual interest and varied building massing, to create distinctive points of entry for users. A combination of concrete tilt up wall panels with a series of reveals and patterns in the tilts will accent the building elevations. Curtain wall glazing systems at each entry location will highlight the material variation, with portions that reach a high elevation to accommodate two to three-story office/retail within the building. These various treatments will be incorporated into the project design to provide variation and texture to the building façade.

## F. Site Design Criteria

The conceptual site plan orients the Project to Manthey Rd. Public access to the Property will be provided via Manthey and Dos Reis Roads in the locations shown on the site plan. These points of access and internal circulation provide good access to users, employees, and customers. Generous landscaping along Dos Reis effectively screens the south elevation from Dos Reis Rd, while dense and tasteful landscape accents the east elevation and the retail portion of the project.

Dedicated truck access located at the very northeast corner of the property is the only access point for ingress and egress of truck traffic. Trucks are restricted from going south of this access point and will come from and to the north towards Roth Rd interchange only.

The conceptual site plan identifies approximately 2,046 parking spaces provided throughout the development. Parking for trucks and employees is provided behind secured, gated access points as depicted on the conceptual site plan. Approximately 1,104 trailer parking spaces are provided behind secured, gated access points.

## G. Landscaping

Project landscaping will be consistent with the Site Plan Review package's landscape plan and area renderings included for conceptual design. The landscape design along rights-of-way and parking areas will be consistent with the Central Lathrop Specific Plan 2 Amendment (CLSP 2) and city zoning requirements for retail. The landscape design in stormwater quality areas will be compliant with the Multi-Agency Post-Construction Stormwater Standards Manual.

Vehicular entries and street frontages will provide a formal entry design sequence, including the use of "offset" of trees along with formal masses of shrubs and groundcovers. The project will match the City of Lathrop's retail design criteria for retail along Manthey Rd. The city's criteria identify London Plane Tree and Chinese Flame trees as primary and secondary trees. A more diverse plant palette will be used. Additional street trees along the Dos Reis Rd frontage include Deodar Cedar, and Chinese Flame trees. Massed shrubs will further screen perimeter screen walls around the Project perimeter and colorful accent shrubs and groundcover plantings will be used around all signage.

The landscape design in proximity to the building will complement the building's high-tech contemporary appearance, as well as the size. Trees and shrubs will provide pedestrian shade and visual interest and will contrast the architectural pop-outs to provide human scale at the entries. Pedestrian walks that connect the Project and parking lots to storefront entries will be appropriately shaded.

## H. Employee Amenities

Employee outdoor break areas with shading and benches/seating have been incorporated into the site plan to allow employees an outdoor space to enjoy break periods. Employee break areas are compliant with the Design Guidelines (Chapter 7) section of the Central Lathrop Specific Plan 2 Amendment (CLSP 2).

## I. Grading and Drainage

The grading and drainage plan for the Property will comply with the City of Lathrop's drainage design standards and the Multi-Agency Post-Construction Stormwater Standards Manual. Storm drainage will be conveyed via internalized roof drains and downspouts, as well as overland flow across the parking lots and truck dock areas. This flow will be directed to curb openings at stormwater quality treatment areas distributed throughout the site. These treatment areas will effectively treat stormwater before it is discharged into the site's storm drain system. Ultimately the onsite storm drain system connects to the existing Watershed 4 storm drain line in Dos Reis Road where that storm water continues west to the existing storm drain pump station at Stanford Crossing and Spartan Way. The stormwater quality treatment areas and the underground storm drainpipe system have been sized to together accommodate a 100-year storm event.

## J. Utilities and Infrastructure

The City of Lathrop will provide water to the Property via a 12 -inch public waterline within Golden Valley Parkway. The project proposes new 12-inch public water lines in Manthey Road and Dos Reis Road.

The City of Lathrop will provide storm sewer and wastewater treatment service. There is an existing sewer main within Golden Valley Parkway. It is anticipated that existing sewer main is to provide a gravity sewer connection to the Property.

## K. Project Schedule

The design phase of the project is expected to begin immediately after the public approval of the Central Lathrop Specific Plan 2 Amendment, Site Plan Review Package, and Conditional Use Permit. Assuming an Improvement/Grading Plan approval in the first half of 2024 construction is expected to commence in the second half of 2024.

## L. Summary

The proposed development will provide benefits to the City of Lathrop by adding a diversity of up to 500 new jobs at full operation involving a significant capital investment more than $\$ 100$ million, and anticipated retail sales exceeding $\$ 30$ million annually and will activate an undeveloped, long-term vacant parcel of land with a quality use that will provide considerable sales tax revenues and other economic benefits to the City of Lathrop.

This Project implements the General Plan, Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment (CLSP 2), zoning, and Design Guidelines that encourage site development and architectural design that will be integrated with the surrounding mixed use residential development. The project's frontage improvement of Dos Reis Road and Manthey Road into their ultimate condition including the landscape buffer previously mentioned along Dos Reis Road will positively influence the area. In summary, this proposal is consistent with the City's long-term vision for this area, it is compatible with the surrounding area.
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## Attachment 10

Ashley Furniture Project CUP-23-08 and SPR-23-09
Environmental Checklist, prepared by De Novo Planning Group, dated August, 2023

Due to the size of this document, it has not been reproduced in the staff report. A copy of the Environmental Checklist is available for viewing and download on the City's website at the following links:

Environmental Checklist without Appendices:
https://www.ci.lathrop.ca.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/comm unity development/page/5622/lathrop ashley warehouse 15183 no appendices.pdf

## Environmental Checklist with Appendices:

https://www.ci.lathrop.ca.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/comm unity development/page/5622/lathrop ashley warehouse 15183 cle an.pdf

The Environmental Checklist can also be viewed at the following link: https://www.ci.lathrop.ca.us/com-dev/page/public-review-documents

Individuals that are unable to access the Environmental Checklist at the website listed above or would require a computer disk or thumb drive containing a copy of the document should contact Planning Staff at planning@ci.lathrop.ca.us or (209) 941-7290 to obtain a copy.

## CITY OF LATHROP PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 23-13

## A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LATHROP RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL FIND THE PROJECT EXEMPT FROM FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21083.3 AND CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15183 AND APPROVE THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND THE SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR THE PROPOSED ASHLEY FURNITURE PROJECT (CUP-23-08 AND SPR-23-09)

WHEREAS, the City of Lathrop Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review pursuant to the Lathrop Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the request is for approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review to allow the construction of an approximately 1.5 million square foot concrete tilt-up building and all necessary supporting infrastructure on property located within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment area as further defined below in the third recital (the proposed Project); and

WHEREAS, the property is located at 14101 S. Manthey Road (APN: 192-020-14) (the property); and

WHEREAS, prior to the City's approval of the 2022 General Plan Update, the City prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which analyzed the environmental impacts of buildout under the General Plan Update pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 , et seq.), and the City of Lathrop City Council certified the Final EIR on September 19, 2022 (State Clearinghouse \# 2021100139); and

WHEREAS, the analysis in the General Plan Update EIR allows the use of CEQA exemption/streamlining provisions for projects developed under the General Plan Update, including the proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, an Environmental Checklist has been prepared for the proposed Project, which is attached to the Planning Commission Staff Report as Attachment 9 and can also be found in the Planning Division project files located at 390 Towne Centre Drive, Lathrop, CA 95330; and

[^0]WHEREAS, proper notice of this public meeting was given in all respects as required by law including the publishing of a legal notice of the hearing in the Manteca Bulletin on or about September 1,2023 , mailed the public notice to notify property owners located within a 300 -foot radius from the project site boundary, emailed to the City's Public Hearing subscribers and interested parties and posted at three (3) locations accessible to the public and the City website; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed all written evidence and oral testimony presented to date.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Commission of the City of Lathrop does hereby make the following findings:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183, the Planning Commission finds as follows:
a. The project complies with CEQA based on the CEQA exemption/streamlining provisions contained in Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183;
b. Pursuant to the Planning Commission Staff Report and the attachments and exhibits thereto, including but not limited to, the CEQA Initial Study Checklist, which are incorporated herein by reference, the proposed Project will not result in any significant impacts that: 1) are peculiar to the project or project site; 2) were not identified as significant project-level, cumulative, or off-site effects in the General Plan Update EIR; or 3) were previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the General Plan Update ERR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the General Plan Update EIR. As a result, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183, the proposed Project is exempt from further environmental review under CEQA.
c. All applicable General Plan Update policy and implementation actions and uniformly applied development policies, standards and/or regulations are, hereby imposed on the proposed Project and must be adhered to by the Project applicant. To the extent the City has not previously made findings regarding any/all of those referenced General Plan policy and implementation actions and uniformly applied development policies, standards and/or regulations, the Planning Commission hereby finds that all of those General Plan Update policy and implementation actions and uniformly applied development policies, standards and/or regulations, were adopted, in whole or in part, to substantially mitigate the potential environmental effects to which they pertain (i.e., aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gases, climate change, and energy, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water
quality, land use, population, and housing, mineral resources noise, public services and recreation, circulation, utilities and services systems, and wildfire).
2. Conditional Use Permit Findings. Pursuant to Section 17.112 .060 of the Lathrop Municipal Code (LMC), the Planning Commission finds as follows:
a. That there are circumstances or conditions applicable to the land, structure or use which makes the granting of a use permit necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right.
The proposed Project represents a major expansion of the existing Ashley Furniture Distribution Center and Retail Outlet located on S. Harlan Road. The proposed Project is consistent with the City's development standards for Limited Industrial.
b. That the proposed location of the conditional use is in accordance with the objectives of the zoning code and the purposes of the district in which the site is located. The proposed project is located in the IL-CL, Limited Industrial Zoning District and the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment area and is a permitted use within the zoning district for which it is located as further established in the Zoning Code Text Amendment.
c. That the proposed use will comply with each of the applicable provisions of the LMC, as amended. As noted above and as described in the Staff Report, the proposed project is a permitted use in the IL-CL, Linited Industrial Zoning District and is consistent with the applicable provisions in the LMC, including screening requirements pursuant to the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment. Additionally, the General Plan required updates to the LMC and Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 in order to ensure that new development is compatible with existing development (Goal LU-5). The proposed project is consistent with the LMC, Policies and Implementation Actions of the General Plan as it relates to truck traffic impacts and land use compatibility.
3. Site Plan Review Findings. Pursuant to Section 17.100 .050 of the Lathrop Municipal Code (LMC), the Planning Commission finds as follows:
a. The proposed Site Plan Review complies with all applicable provisions of Chapter 17.100;
b. The proposed Site Plan Review is consistent with the site improvements listed in Chapter 17.100 (a. through i.) and improvements are such that traffic congestion is avoided and pedestrian and vehicular safety and welfare are protected and there will not be adverse effects on surrounding properties;
c. Proposed lighting for the project area is so arranged as to deflect away from adjoining properties; and
d. The proposed Site Plan Review is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the City as further evaluated in the Environmental Checklist.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, based on substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings and pursuant to its independent review and consideration, the Lathrop Planning Commission does hereby recommend that the Lathrop City Council approve Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-23-08 and Site Plan Review No. SPR-23-09, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment 2 of the September 13, 2023 Staff Report and incorporated by reference herein.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Lathrop at a Special meeting on the $13^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2023 by the following vote:

AYES: Ishihara, Camarena, Jackson, Rhodes
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ralmilay

ATTEST:



## APPROVED AS TO FORM:



Salvador Navarrete, City Attorney


September 13, 2023
Rick Caguiat
Community Development Director
Planning Commission Secretary
Community Development Department
390 Towne Centre Drive
Lathrop, California 95330
planning@ci.lathrop.ca.us
Re: Comment on Planning Commission Agenda Items No. 8.3 Regarding the Ashley Furniture Project (Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-23-08; Site Plan Review No. SPR 23-09)

Dear Mr. Caguiat and Honorable Members of the Planning Commission:
I am writing on behalf of Laborers' International Union of North America, Local Union No. 73 ("LIUNA") regarding the proposed Ashley Furniture Project proposed to be located at the northwest corner of Dos Reis Rd and Manthey Road. The Planning Commission staff have determined that the project is exempt from the requirement for preparation of environmental documents pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Guidelines, Section 15183 and Public Resources Code § 21083.3. However, after reviewing the Environmental Checklist and relevant appendices prepared for the Project, and the 2022 General Plan Update EIR that the Project relies upon, we conclude that the Project does not meet the requirements for an exemption under CEQA Guideline § 15183 and PRC § 21083.3. LIUNA respectfully requests that the Planning Commission not recommend approval of each of the agenda items addressed by the proposed exemption and, in particular, the proposed Ashley Furniture Project, and instead request staff to prepare the necessary environmental documents under CEQA.

## I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project proposes to construct and operate a $1,486,607$ square foot industrial building including a mix of retail, office/call center, and warehouse and distribution uses. About 110,000 square feet would be dedicated to retail use, 24,000 square feet to office and call-center uses, and $1,352,347$ square feet to warehouse and distribution center uses.
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The Project proposes to construct approximately 2,046 parking spaces throughout the development site, with 942 spaces for passenger vehicles and 1,104 spaces for truck trailer parking. The Project expects to generate 2,798 daily passenger vehicle trips, including 203 a.m. peak hour trips ( 124 inbound, 79 outbound) and 255 p.m. peak hour trips ( 110 inbound, 145 outbound) for passenger vehicles. Another 680 daily truck trips also are expected, including 95 a.m. peak hour trips and 45 p.m. peak hour trips.

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

To achieve its objectives of environmental protection, CEQA has a three-tiered structure. 14 CCR § 15002(k); Committee to Save the Hollywoodland Specific Plan v. City of Los Angeles (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 1168, 1185-86 ("Hollywoodland"). First, if a project falls into an exempt category, or it can be seen with certainty that the activity in question will not have a significant effect on the environment, no further agency evaluation is required. Id. Second, if there is a possibility the project will have a significant effect on the environment, the agency must perform an initial threshold study. ld.; 14 CCR § 15063(a). If the study indicates that there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment the agency may issue a negative declaration. Id.; 14 CCR §§ 15063(b)(2), 15070. Finally, if the project will have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report ("EIR") is required. Id.

Here, since the City purports to exempt the Project from CEQA entirely, the first step of the CEQA process applies. "Exemptions to CEQA are narrowly construed and '[e]xemption categories are not to be expanded beyond the reasonable scope of their statutory language." Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish \& Game Com. (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105,125 . The determination as to the appropriate scope of an exemption is a question of law subject to independent, or de novo, review. San Lorenzo Valley Community Advocates for Responsible Education v. San Lorenzo Valley Unified School Dist., (2006) 139 CaI . App. 4th 1356, 1375 ("[Q]uestions of interpretation or application of the requirements of CEQA are matters of law. Thus, for example, interpreting the scope of a CEQA exemption presents 'a question of law, subject to de novo review by this court.'")

Here, the City proposes that the Project is exempt from CEQA review under Section 15183 and PRC § 21083.3. However, as discussed below, the use of these streamlining provisions is improper, and instead, a full CEQA analysis, such as an EIR, must be prepared for this Project.

## III. DISCUSSION

## a. The City Incorrectly Applied CEQA's Section 15183 Categorical Exemption to the Project and Thus a Full CEQA Analysis is Required.

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act allows a project to avoid environmental review if it is "consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified . . except as might be necessary to examine whether there are projectspecific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site." 14 CCR 15183 (emphasis added). See PRC § 21083.3(b). The intention of this section is to "streamline[]" CEQA review for projects and avoid the preparation of repetitive documents. While the City refers to these provisions as exemptions from CEQA, environmental review is still required for various types of impacts, including those "peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located," those which "were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR," "are potentially significant offsite impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR," or "[a]re previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR."

Section (f) of section 15183 states that a Project's environmental effects are not peculiar to a project if "uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted" which serve to mitigate environmental impacts, "unless substantial new information shows that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the environmental effect." The standard set forth by the statute for this analysis is substantial evidence.

Here, there is substantial evidence demonstrating that the Project will have significant impacts which were not addressed in the EIR prepared for the 2022 General Plan Update. Section 15183 therefore does not apply, and the City must prepare appropriate CEQA documents for this Project.

## b. The City Must Prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations With Regard to This Project.

The 2022 General Plan Update concluded that several of the impacts identified as a result of the General Plan Update project were significant and unavoidable. These impacts included agricultural resources, air quality, greenhouse gas, and traffic noise impacts. In the Environmental Checklist prepared for the Project, the City acknowledges these significant and unavoidable impacts, but states that:

Impacts from buildout of the General Plan including cumulative impacts associated with development and buildout of the CLSP Phase 2 plan area
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and the warehouse Project site, as proposed, were fully addressed in the General Plan EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2021100139), and implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new or altered impacts beyond those addressed in the General Plan EIR.

Envt'l Checklist, p. 13. Similar statements are repeated for each of the specific unavoidable significant impacts. This conclusion does not, however, address all of the City's obligations to grapple with acknowledged significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts.

In the case of Communities for a Better Environment v. Cal. Resources Agency, the court of appeal held that, although tiering may allow a later project to rely on the environmental analysis contained in a prior program-level EIR, that procedure does not relieve the agency of acknowledging the significant and unavoidable impacts and reconsidering its statement of overriding considerations. As the Court explained:

The section appears to allow an agency, in approving a later project that has significant unavoidable impacts, to forego making a statement of overriding considerations specifically tied to that project. This is contrary to CEQA law. CEQA section 21094, subdivision (d) requires agencies that approve a later project to comply with CEQA section 21081. Under CEQA section 21081 , an agency approving a project with significant environmental effects must find that each effect will be mitigated or avoided, or "that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the ... effect[] ...." 65 The requirement of a statement of overriding considerations is central to CEQA's role as a public accountability statute; it requires public officials, in approving environmentally detrimental projects, to justify their decisions based on counterbalancing social, economic or other benefits, and to point to substantial evidence in support. ${ }^{66}$ Under Guidelines section $15152(\mathrm{f})(3)(\mathrm{C})$, however, an agency apparently could adopt one statement of overriding considerations for a prior, more general EIR, and then avoid future political accountability by approving later, more specific projects with significant unavoidable impacts pursuant to the prior EIR and statement of overriding considerations. Even though a prior EIR's analysis of environmental effects may be subject to being incorporated in a later EIR for a later, more specific project, the responsible public officials must still go on the record and explain specifically why they are approving the later project despite its significant unavoidable impacts.

Communities for a Better Env't v. California Res. Agency, 103 Cal. App. 4th 98, 124-25, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 441 (2002), as modified (Nov. 21, 2002), and disapproved of on other grounds by Berkeley Hillside Pres. v. City of Berkeley, 60 Cal. 4th 1086, 343 P.3d 834 (2015).
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The same reasoning applies to the implementation of Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3 and 14 CaI . Admin. Code § 15183. The Project, based on its reliance on the 2022 General Plan Update EIR, will have cumulative impacts on agricultural resources, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic noise. Although sections 21083 and 15183 provide for streamlining of the environmental review of a subsequent project, neither section relieves the City from its obligation to make a statement of overriding considerations for the Project. PRC § 21081. Prior to recommending the Project and applying the streamlining provisions, the Planning Commission should prepare a statement of overriding considerations supported by substantial evidence and which evaluates whether any additional feasible mitigation measures applicable to this specific project should be required in order to address the acknowledged cumulative impacts.

## c. The Project Will Have Project-Specific Significant Effects Which Were Not Addressed in the 2022 General Plan Update EIR.

LIUNA is concerned that a number of significant environmental impacts peculiar to the Project were not addressed in the 2022 General Plan Update EIR. As a result, Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3 and 14 Cal. Admin. Code $\S 15183$ do not apply and either a mitigated negative declaration or EIR must be prepared to address these unanalyzed impacts.

## i. Biological Resources

According to the 2022 General Plan EIR, the federally-listed, endangered valley elderberry longhorn beetle (Desmocerus californicus dimorphus) did not occur within one-mile of the planning area. GP EIR, p. 3.4-15. As a result, there is no focused discussion in the 2022 General Plan EIR on any impacts to this federally-listed species. In general, the 2022 General Plan EIR concludes that there will be no significant impacts to listed species from the General Plan's implementation. GP EIR, p. 2.4-28 -3.4-29. The valley elderberry longhorn beetle relies on a particular host plant for its survival - the red or blue elderberry. See Biological Resources Analysis Report, p. 18. The reconnaissance survey conducted for the Biological Resources Analysis observed a 6 -foot by 15 -foot elderberry shrub on the property. Id., p. 19. The presence of that host plant, the enhanced likelihood of the presence of the endangered valley elderberry longhorn beetle, and the heightened risk of adverse affects on the host plant or potentially present beetles are not addressed as a significant impact in the 2022 General Plan EIR and these effects are peculiar to the Project site. Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3. Given these facts peculiar to the site, it "might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site." 14 CCR 15183.

Likewise, the observed presence of a Swainson's hawk foraging on the project site and nesting within 20 feet of the site also results in obvious effects peculiar to the
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project site, including not only the direct loss of foraging habitat but also disturbances from construction activities at the site and a dramatic increase in vehicles using Dos Reis Road to access the project once it is operational. Because impacts to Swainson's hawks were not addressed as significant impacts in the 2022 General Plan EIR and impact to a Swainson's hawk is peculiar to the site, those potential impacts must be addressed in a proper CEQA environmental review document and reliance on Pub. Res. Code $\S 21083.3$ and 14 Cal. Admin. Code § 15183 is inappropriate.

Given the very limited reconnaissance-level survey performed on a single day at the Project site on May 5, 2021, LIUNA is concerned that there are numerous other listed and sensitive species foraging or located at the Project site. No effort has been made to determine the current presence of burrowing owls at the site. The past presence of red-tailed hawks and white-tailed kites foraging at the site also excludes the proposed streamlining exemption. A current and more robust survey of the Project site is necessary for the City to make any decision on these potential impacts based on substantial evidence.

In addition, the 2022 General Plan EIR does not identify the significant potential impact of the Project's thousands of trucks and car trips on wildlife from vehicle collisions with wildlife. This impact is peculiar to the Project given its proposed 2,798 daily passenger vehicle trips and 680 daily truck trips which will lead to wildlife collisions in the vicinity of the Project. Because this project-specific direct and cumulative effect was not addressed at all in the 2022 General Plan EIR, it must be addressed in an EIR or potentially a mitigated negative declaration for the Project. See PRC § 21083.3(c) ("Nothing in this section affects any requirement to analyze potentially significant offsite impacts and cumulative impacts of the project not discussed in the prior environmental impact report with respect to the general plan").

## ii. Energy

The 2022 General Plan EIR's discussion of the General Plan's energy impacts boils down to stating that by complying with California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards ("CalGreen"), promoting the use of renewable energy sources and encouraging public transportation and bicycle use, and the fact that PG\&E will generally make progress on adding new renewable energy sources to its portfolio, projects within the planning area will not have energy impacts. GP EIR, p. 3.7-41-3.7-42. The Environmental Checklist focuses on the Ashley Furniture Project's compliance with CalGreen and PG\&E's long-term efforts. Env't Checklist, p. 66. None of these considerations address the energy effects that are peculiar to a 1.4 million square feet furniture distribution and retail center.

The standard under CEQA is whether the Project would result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Failing to undertake "an investigation into renewable energy options that might be available or appropriate for a
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project" violates CEQA. California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 213. Energy conservation under CEQA is defined as the "wise and efficient use of energy." CEQA Guidelines, app. F, §I. The "wise and efficient use of energy" is achieved by "(1) decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, (2) decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas and oil, and (3) increasing reliance on renewable energy resources." Id.

Noting compliance with the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Cal.Code Regs., tit. 24, part 6 (Title 24) does not constitute an adequate analysis of energy impacts. Ukiah Citizens for Safety First v. City of Ukiah (2016) 248 Cal.App.4th 256, 264-65. Similarly, the court in City of Woodland held unlawful an energy analysis that relied on compliance with Title 24, that failed to assess transportation energy impacts, and that failed to address renewable energy impacts. California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland, 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 209-13. As such, the General Plan EIR's reliance on Title 24 compliance does not address the proposed furniture warehouse Project's energy impacts. The energy effects of the Project are, by definition, peculiar to the Project. Given the vast expanse of roofing provided by the proposed Project, any evaluation of its energy impacts cannot ignore the obvious feasibility of an array of solar panels on the roof or covering the extensive parking proposed at the site. Energy efficiency, in the context of the Proposed project and site would require the consideration and implementation of sufficient solar panels to meet all of the Project's direct electricity demand, as well as solar power that would offset the considerable GHG and other air pollution emissions that will result from the thousands of trucks and cars driving to and from the Project every day once it's operational.

The Environmental Checklist contains no discussion of the project's cost effectiveness in terms of energy requirements. There is no discussion of energy consuming equipment and processes that will be used during the construction or operation of the project. The project's energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction and operation were not identified. The effect of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity has not been addressed. As such, the Environmental Checklist's conclusions are unsupported by the necessary discussions of the Project's energy impacts under CEQA. An EIR or possibly a mitigated negative declaration must be prepared to assess these impacts.

## iii. Greenhouse Gases and Air Quality.

The 2022 General Plan EIR did not project air pollution emissions for any given project that would be allowed by the plan. Instead, it identifies the implementation measure in the General Plan that the City "[review development, infrastructure, and planning projects for consistency with SJVAPCD requirements during the CEQA review process." GP EIR, p. 3.3-35 (RR-6a). The General Plan and the EIR go on to further require that:

Require project applicants to prepare air quality analyses to address SJVAPCD and General Plan requirements, which include analysis and identification of:
A. Air pollutant emissions associated with the project during construction, project operation, and cumulative conditions.
B. Potential exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants.
C. Significant air quality impacts associated with the project for construction, project operation, and cumulative conditions.
D. Mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to less than significant or the maximum extent feasible where impacts cannot be mitigated to less than significant.

Id. Although the Environmental Checklist purports to describe these evaluation efforts, the Checklist does not provide any of the input files for the air pollution modeling conducted for the proposed Project. Only the output files are provided. Environmental Checklist, Attachment I, p. 162. Given the size of the warehouse and the number of expected daily truck trips, LIUNA is skeptical that the emissions forecasts identified for its construction and operation can be substantiated. Before making a recommendation to the Council, the Planning Commission should require staff and the applicant to share their input files for the CaIEEMod modeling in order for the public to be able to assess the accuracy of the model outputs and whether or not the Project's may have a significant effect on air quality and GHG emissions and the extent of necessary mitigation measures as required by the General Plan.

## IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above comments, the City must prepare an EIR or, if appropriate, a mitigated negative declaration for the Project. LIUNA reserves its right to submit additional comments and evidence for any subsequent Planning Commission hearing or the City Council's consideration of the Project. Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,


Michael R. Lozeau


## BY E-MAIL

October 6, 2023

Lathrop City Council
Sonny Dhaliwal, Mayor
Paul Akinjo, Vice Mayor
Minnie Diallo, Councilmember
Diane Lazard, Councilmember

Teresa Vargas, MMC
City Clerk
390 Towne Centre Drive
Lathrop, CA 95330
website_cco@ci.lathrop.ca.us

Re: Comment on Ashley Furniture Project (CUP-23-08; SPR 23-09) City Council Agenda Item No. 5.3

Dear Mayor Dhaliwal, Vice Mayor Akinjo, and Honorable Councilmembers:
I am writing on behalf of Laborers' International Union of North America, Local Union No. 73 ("LIUNA") regarding the Ashley Furniture Project ("Project") proposed to be located at the northwest corner of Dos Reis Rd and Manthey Road. The Planning Commission voted to recommend that the City Council find that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183 (14 CCR § 15183) and Public Resources Code ("PRC") section 21083.3. However, after reviewing the Environmental Checklist prepared for the Project and the 2022 General Plan Update EIR that the Project relies upon, we conclude that the Project does not meet the requirements for an exemption under CEQA Guideline $\S 15183$ and PRC $\S 21083.3$. As such, LIUNA respectfully requests that the City Council refrain from approving the Project until the Project undergoes environmental review under CEQA.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The Project proposes to construct and operate a $1,486,607$ square foot industrial building including a mix of retail, office/call center, and warehouse and distribution uses. About 110,000 square feet would be dedicated to retail use, 24,000 square feet to office and call-center uses, and $1,352,347$ square feet to warehouse and distribution center uses.

The Project proposes to construct approximately 2,046 parking spaces throughout the development site, with 942 spaces for passenger vehicles and 1,104 spaces for truck trailer
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parking. The Project expects to generate 2,798 daily passenger vehicle trips, including 203 a.m. peak hour trips ( 124 inbound, 79 outbound) and 255 p.m. peak hour trips ( 110 inbound, 145 outbound) for passenger vehicles. Another 680 daily truck trips also are expected, including 95 a.m. peak hour trips and 45 p.m. peak hour trips.

The Project site is located within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan ("CLSP") Phase 2 area, which was approved by the City in 2004. In 2022, the City certified an environmental impact report ("EIR") for the City"s 2022 General Plan Update ("2022 GP EIR"), which changed the land use designations in the CLSP Phase 2 area from Residential/Commercial to Limited Industrial. An Environmental Checklist was prepared for the Project to evaluate consistency with the 2022 GP EIR.

On September 13, 2023, the Planning Commission voted to recommend that the City Council approve the Project conditional use permit (CUP-23-08) and site plan review (SPR-2309 ) and find that the Project is exempt from further environmental review under Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183 because the Project would not result in any impacts beyond those addressed in the 2022 GP EIR. Prior to the Planning Commission meeting, LIUNA submitted a written comment attached hereto as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.

## LEGAL STANDARD

To achieve its objectives of environmental protection, CEQA has a three-tiered structure. (Committee to Save the Hollywoodland Specific Plan v. City of Los Angeles (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 1168, 1185-86 (Hollywoodland) [citing 14 CCR § 15002(k)].). First, if a project falls into an exempt category, or it can be seen with certainty that the activity in question will not have a significant effect on the environment, no further agency evaluation is required. (Id. at 1185.) Second, if there is a possibility the project will have a significant effect on the environment, the agency must perform an initial threshold study and may issue a negative declaration if the study indicates no significant impacts. (Id. at $1185-86$; see also 14 CCR §§ 15063(b)(2), 15070.) Finally, if the project will have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report ("EIR") is required. (Hollywoodland, supra, 161 Cal.App.4th at 1186.)

Here, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council find the Project exempt from CEQA under CEQA Guidelines section 15183 ("Section 15183"), which, for projects "which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified," does not require additional environmental review for such projects "except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site." (14 CCR § 15183(a).)

The purpose of Section 15183 is to streamline CEQA review and relieves the City of the obligation to prepare an EIR if a qualifying project's impacts "[are] not peculiar to the parcel or
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to the project, [have] been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards." (14 CCR § 15183 (c).) Section 15183 further explains,

An effect of a project on the environment shall not be considered peculiar to the project or the parcel for the purposes of this section if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted by the city or county with a finding that the development policies or standards will substantially mitigate that environmental effect when applied to future projects, unless substantial new information shows that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the environmental effect.
( 14 CCR § $15183(\mathrm{f})$.) A city's decision to utilize Section 15183 is governed by the substantial evidence standard of review. (Lucas v. City of Pomona (2023) 92 Cal.App.5th 508, 538.)

## DISCUSSION

## I. The Project Is Not Exempt from CEQA Under Section 15183 Due to Unmitigated, Project-Specific Impacts to Biological Resources.

LIUNA retained wildlife biology expert Dr. Shawn Smallwood, Ph.D., who conducted a site visit and reviewed the Project's documentation, including the Environmental Checklist and the Biological Resources Analysis Report prepared by Olberding Environmental, Inc. dated May 2021 ("Biological Report"). Dr. Smallwood found the Project would result in significant, unmitigated impacts to multiple special-status species of wildlife. Dr. Smallwood`s comment and CV are attached as Exhibit A.

## A. The Project's Biological Report underestimates the diversity of species using the Project site.

Dr. Smallwood conducted a site visit to the Project site for approximately 2.5 hours on September 21, 2023. (Ex. A, p. 1.) During those visits, Dr. Smallwood "detected 35 species of vertebrate wildlife, including 10 special-status species," including Swainson`s hawk, which is listed as a threatened species in California, and loggerhead shrike, a California Species of Special Concern priority level 2. (Id. at pp. 3-4.) Dr. Smallwood estimates that with additional surveys, a total of 178 species would be detected at the Project site, of which 51 would be special-status species. (Id., p. 9.) Based on his site visit and projections, Dr. Smallwood concluded that " $[\mathrm{m}]$ ore surveys are needed" and "the species richness at the site relative to its level of disturbance is peculiar to the site." (Id., p. 10.)

## B. The Project's Biological Report fails to accurately characterize the existing environmental setting.

Dr. Smallwood found that the Project's Biological Report failed "to accurately
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characterize the existing environmental setting, including the biological species that use the site, their relative abundances, how they use the site, key ecological relationships, and known and ongoing threats to those species with special status." (Ex. A, p. 10.) He explains that an accurate characterization of the environmental setting typically relies on two factors: (1) field surveys and (2) reviews of literature and databases. (Id.) For this Project, "these needed steps were grossly inadequate." (Id.)

First, the Biological Report's field survey lacked critical information, including the time of day of the survey or the duration of the survey, and did not meet the minimum standards for surveys of plants (Ex. A, p. 11.) Further, the Biological Report's survey only detected 6 species of vertebrate wildlife at the Project site, which is that number that Dr. Smallwood detected in his first two minutes on the Project site on September 21, 2023. (Id.) The survey also only detected 3 special-status species, whereas Dr. Smallwood detected 10. (Id.) Additionally, the Biological Report's survey made no mention of the great horned owl pellets, kangaroo rat and Botta's pocket gopher burrow systems, or birds smaller than a white-tailed kite as were observed by Dr. Smallwood. (Id.) The Biological Report had no surveys for bats or several special-status species known to occur in the area, including burrowing owl and Swainson's hawk. (Id.)

Second, the Biological Report's review of available wildlife databases was inadequate. (Ex. A, pp. 12-13.) The Biological Report relied solely on the California Natural Diversity Data Base ("CNDDB") to determine which species have potential to occur in the project area. The Biological Report did not consult other known databases, such as iNaturalist or eBird. When searching CNDDB, the Biological Report only searched for species with documented occurrences within the nearest CNDDB quadrangles, which "screens out many special-status species from further consideration in the characterization of the wildlife community as part of the baseline environmental setting." (Id., p. 12.) Furthermore, "CNDDB is not designed to support absence determinations or to screen out species from characterization of a site's wildlife community." (Id.) Based on available databases and site visits, Dr. Smallwood estimates that "107 special-status species of wildlife are known to occur near enough to the site to warrant analysis of occurrence potential." (Id., p. 20.)

Third, the Biological Report improperly assumed that the Project site's lack of nesting habitat means that development of the Project would not cause impacts to wildlife species. However, as Dr. Smallwood explains,
[T]here is no sound scientific distinction between nesting habitat and some other characterization of habitat. For any given species, the environment of a site is either habitat or it is not, as habitat is defined as that part of the environment that is used by a species. . . . Certain portions of a species’ habitat may provide nesting opportunities, but all parts of its habitat are critical to the nesting success of members of the species. If an animal cannot find sufficient forage and cover during non-nesting season or at portions of its habitat where it does not normally nest, then it might not survive to reproduce or its nesting attempt might not succeed. [The Biological Report] asserts a false distinction of the value of a site based on whether
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the species nests on-site.
(Ex. A, p. 19.) By limiting habitat to only nesting habitat, the Biological Report underestimates the value of the Project site and the impacts to species that may occur. For example, the Biological Report claimed that loggerhead shrike have a low likelihood of occurrence on the Project site due to lack of trees and shrubs needed for nesting. However, Dr. Smallwood observed a loggerhead shrike foraging on the Project site during his site visit. This is just one example of how the Biological Report misjudged the occurrence likelihood of the many specialstatus species discussed in the Biological Report as well as the potential wildlife impacts peculiar to this specific site.

## C. The Biological Report failed to adequately analyze and mitigate the Project's biological impacts due to habitat loss, wildlife movement, and vehicle collisions.

Dr. Smallwood found that the Biological Report and Environmental Checklist failed to address numerous potentially significant impacts that the Project may have on biological resources, including habitat loss, wildlife movement, collision mortality due to Project-generated traffic, and cumulative impacts. (Ex. A, pp. 18-25.)

## 1. Habitat Loss and Fragmentation

Dr. Smallwood warns that " $[\mathrm{t}]$ he project would destroy 89.92 acres of habitat to every species of wildlife that makes use of the project site." (Ex. A, p. 20.) Dr. Smallwood predicts that development of the Project would result in the loss of 191 bird nest sites and a lost breeding capacity of 630 birds per year. (Id., pp. 20-21.) Dr. Smallwood concludes that this impact is significant. (Id.)

## 2. Wildlife Movement

The Biological Report provided a "flawed and misleading" analysis of the Project's impact on wildlife movement. (Ex. A, p. 21.) According to the Environmental Checklist, the Biological Report "included a CNDDB record search that did not reveal any documented wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites on or adjacent to warehouse site." However, as Dr. Smallwood explains, "CNDDB is not where an analyst would find information relevant to whether a site is important to wildlife movement. . . . . In effect. there is no analysis of whether the project would interfere with wildlife movement." (Id.)

The Environmental Checklist also claims that the Project's impacts on wildlife movement were adequately addressed in the 2022 GP EIR. However, the 2022 GP EIR only focused on the San Joaquin River as a wildlife corridor. As such, " $[t]$ he General Plan EIR implies the premise that interference with wildlife movement in the region can result only from a project's disruption of the function of a wildlife movement corridor." (Ex. A, p. 21.) This is not the proper standard under CEQA. Rather, CEQA requires an analysis of impacts to wildlife movement "regardless of
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whether the movement is channeled by a corridor. A site such as the project site is critically important for wildlife movement because it composes an increasingly diminishing area of open space within a growing expanse of anthropogenic uses, forcing more species of volant wildlife to use the site for stopover and staging during migration, dispersal, and home range patrol." (Id.) By ignoring this standard, the Biological Report has failed to adequately and mitigate the Project's impacts on wildlife movement disruptions that are unique to the Project site.

## 3. Vehicle Collisions

The Biological Report and 2022 GP EIR failed to analyze wildlife mortality and injuries caused by Project-generated traffic. (Ex. A, pp. 22-24.) Dr. Smallwood estimates that the Project would result in 6,151 vertebrate deaths annually due to collisions with Project-generated traffic. (Id., pp. 24.) Especially due to the special-status species likely to occur at or near the Project, these collisions represent a significant impact to wildlife that has not been addressed, discussed, or mitigated by the Environmental Checklist or 2022 GP EIR. But for the Project, these additional wildlife collisions would not occur.

## 4. Cumulative Impacts

The Environmental Checklist concludes that cumulative impacts to biological resources were addressed in the 2022 GP EIR, which relies on the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan ("SJMSCP") to prevent significant cumulative impacts. However, as discussed in greater detail below, the SJMSCP has failed at conserving wildlife species and cannot be relied upon to conclude that cumulative impacts will be less than significant. (Ex. A, pp. 24-25.)

## D. The Project cannot rely on the SJMSCP to mitigate the Project's impacts to biological resources.

To mitigate the project's impacts to biological resources, the Environmental Checklist requires compliance with the SJMSCP, as required by the 2020 General Plan. (Envt. Checklist, p. 55.) However, as Dr. Smallwood explains, the SJMSCP cannot be relied upon to mitigate the Project's impacts "[d]ue to grossly deficient implementation and due to poor performance of the SJMSCP." (Ex. A, p. 25.) Dr. Smallwood identified several shortcomings of the SJMSCP, as discussed below.

First, the majority of special-status species likely to occur at the Project site are not covered by the SJMSCP. (Ex. A, p. 26.) As a result, "the SJMSCP insufficiently covers specialstatus species that would be adversely affected by the project." (Id.) The reason that so many species are not covered by the SJMSCP is that more and more species have been designated as "special-status" since adoption of the SJMSCP. The SJMSCP does not provide any protection for those species.

Second, the SJMSCP requires protocol-level detection surveys. (Ex. A, p. 26.) Yet, no
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such surveys have been conducted on the Project site. (Id.) Detection surveys must be conducted, especially for burrowing owl and Swainson's hawk, to properly comply with the SJMSCP.

Third, Dr. Smallwood conducted an in-depth review of the SJMSCP and found that, to date, the SJMSCP has utterly failed at conserving special status-species. (Ex. A, pp. 26-33.) ${ }^{1}$ To conduct his analysis, Dr. Smallwood reviewed the SJMSCP's Annual Reports published since 2008. As an initial matter, he found that the Annual Reports had flaws with study design, deficient implementation, and poor reporting, including inconsistent naming of preserve areas, a failure to conduct any trend analysis, and a failure to report survey methods including time, duration, or standards. (Id., pp. 27-28.) Dr. Smallwood's review of the Annual Reports revealed several unsettling trends demonstrating the SJMSCP's failure to conserve species, including a decline in Swainson's hawk detections (id., p. 29), a decline in detections of species covered by the SJMSCP (id., p. 30), a decline in detections of all species (id.), a decline in the productivity of Swainson’s hawk (id., p. 32), and a decline in the number of acres surveyed (id., p. 33). Based on this analysis, Dr. Smallwood concludes that " $[\mathrm{t}]$ he SJMSCP has failed in its implementation, and it has proven ineffective at conserving its covered species; it should not be used to mitigate impacts to wildlife that occur on the project site. (Id.)

Although Section 15183 exempts project from further CEQA review where projectspecific impacts can be mitigated by uniformly applied development policies or standards (such as the SJMSCP), the exemption does not apply if "new information shows that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the environmental effect." (14 CCR § 15183(f).) Here, Dr. Smallwood's analysis of the SJHSCP's Annual Records presents new information showing that the SJMSCP has failed to substantially mitigate impacts to wildlife and, therefore, cannot substantially mitigate the Project's impacts. As a result, the City's reliance on Section 15183 is misplaced.

## E. The additional mitigation measures required for the Project's impacts to biological resources are inadequate and render the Project ineligible for an exemption under Section 15183.

In addition to compliance with the SJMSCP, the Project is required to adopt the mitigation recommendations identified in the Biological Report, which include preconstruction surveys for reptiles, birds, and burrowing owls. (Envt'l Checklist, pp. 52-54.) The need for these additional mitigation measures is proof in and of itself that the Project will result in Projectspecific impacts that have not been adequately addressed or mitigated by the 2022 GP EIR. Section 15183 exempts projects with project-specific impacts only where those impacts "can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards." (14CCR §5183(c).) The preconstruction surveys required for this Project are not uniformly applied policies or standards. Rather, they are specific mitigation measures taken from
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the Biological Report specifically designed to mitigate this Project's peculiar impacts to wildlife that are not addressed in the 2022 GP EIR. As a result, the Project does not qualify for an exemption under Section 15183 and further CEQA analysis is required for the Project.

Moreover, as Dr. Smallwood explains, pre-construction surveys are inadequate to mitigate the Project's impacts. (Ex. A, pp. 33-35.) Rather, protocol-level detection surveys are necessary because detection surveys have a much greater probability of detection than pre-construction-surveys. (Id., p. 33.) Dr. Smallwood explains that " $[\mathrm{b}]$ irds are highly skilled at hiding their nests" and "[l]oggerhead shrikes and burrowing owls, as examples, make efforts to fool human observers into thinking the birds' nests are located where they are not." (Id. p. 34.) As a result, "[I]ocating nest sites of these species and most others requires multiple surveys over long time periods . . . This is why the breeding-season survey protocols require multiple surveys spaced through much of the breeding season." (Id.) Furthermore, even with pre-construction surveys, impacts to wildlife would not be reduced to less-than-significant levels because such surveys do nothing to mitigate the additional impacts identified by Dr. Smallwood, including breeding capacity and habitat fragmentation. (Id.) Therefore, the Project will result in Projectspecific impacts to biological resources that remain significant and unmitigated.

## II. The Analysis of the Project's Impacts to Human Health from Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants Is Inadequate.

For warehouses and distribution centers within 1,000 feet of planned residential uses or other sensitive receptors, the 2022 General Plan requires "requires the preparation of a Health Risk Assessment ("HRA") that meets the standards established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District ("SJVAPCD"). (2022 GP, p. 3.3-31 [LU-5c].) The General Plan prohibits approval of such a project " until it can be demonstrated that the project would not result in an exceedance of the established thresholds of significance for public health risks at nearby sensitive receptors." (Id.)

Here, there are numerous sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the Project, including clusters of residences 320 feet, 400 feet, and 940 feet away and a single residence 820 feet away (Envt'l Checklist, p. 43.) According to the Environmental Checklist, an HRA was conducted and found that the Project's increased cancer risk from emissions of diesel particulate matter ("DPM") would not exceed SJVAPCD"s significance threshold of 20 in one million. (Id., pp. 4445.) LIUNA retained air quality experts Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg., and Paul E. Rosenfeld, Ph.D., of the Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise ("SWAPE") to review the HRA. SWAPE found that HRA did not comply with the standards established by OEHHA and, as a result, the Project's impacts had not been adequately evaluated. SWAPE's comment and CVs are attached as Exhibit B.

First, SWAPE notes that the Checklist failed to provide the exposure assumptions for the HRA, such as the age sensitivity factors ("ASF") or fraction of time at home ("FAH") values, and, as a result, the HRA may underestimate the Project's increased cancer risk. (Ex. B, p. 2.)
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Additionally, the Checklist failed to provide the dose and risk equation used to calculate the Project's cancer risks. (Id.) Without providing this equation, there is no way to verify that the HRA utilized the proper equation recommended by OEHHA. (Id.)

Second, even though the 2022 General Plan requires that the HRA meet the standards established by OEHHA, the HRA prepared for the Project failed to do so because it only analyzed the Project's operational cancer risks but completely ignored the Project's construction-related cancer risks. According to OEHHA, the cancer risk of all short-term projects lasting at least 2 months should be assessed and projects lasting more than 6 months should be evaluated for the duration of the project. (Ex. B, p. 3.) Because construction of the Project will surely last at least 2 months (and may exceed six months), the HRA should have included construction-related emissions in addition to operational emissions. The HRA further conflicts with OEHHA guidance by failing to evaluate the lifetime cancer risk to nearby receptors as a result of Project construction and operation combined. (Id.)

Due to these shortcomings, the HRA does not comply with OEHHA standards as required by the 2022 General Plan and underestimates the Project's cancer risks. As a result, the City lacks substantial evidence to conclude that the Project will not result in specific health impacts. Furthermore, the City lacks substantial evidence to conclude that the Project's impacts were addressed in the 2022 GP EIR since the 2022 General Plan required compliance with OEHHA standards, which the Project's HRA did not do. The HRA must be updated prior to any approval of the Project.

## III. The Analysis of the Project's Energy Impacts Is Inadequate.

The 2022 GP EIR's discussion of the General Plan's energy impacts boils down to stating that by complying with California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards ("CalGreen"), promoting the use of renewable energy sources and encouraging public transportation and bicycle use, and the fact that PG\&E will generally make progress on adding new renewable energy sources to its portfolio, projects within the planning area will not have energy impacts. (2022 GP EIR, pp. 3.7-41 to 3.7-42.) The Environmental Checklist focuses on the Ashley Furniture Project's compliance with CalGreen and PG\&E's long-term efforts. (Env't Checklist, p. 66.) None of these considerations address the energy effects that are peculiar to a 1.4 million square feet furniture distribution and retail center.

The standard under CEQA is whether the Project would result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Failing to undertake "an investigation into renewable energy options that might be available or appropriate for a project" violates CEQA. (California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 213.) Energy conservation under CEQA is defined as the "wise and efficient use of energy." (CEQA Guidelines, app. F, § I.) The "wise and efficient use of energy" is achieved by "(1) decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, (2) decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas and oil, and (3) increasing reliance on renewable energy resources." (Id.)
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Noting compliance with the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Cal.Code Regs., tit. 24, part 6 (Title 24)) does not constitute an adequate analysis of energy impacts. (Ukiah Citizens for Safety First v. City of Ukiah (2016) 248 Cal.App.4th 256, 264-65.) Similarly, the court in City of Woodland held unlawful an energy analysis that relied on compliance with Title 24, that failed to assess transportation energy impacts, and that failed to address renewable energy impacts. (California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland, 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 209-13.) As such, the General Plan EIR's reliance on Title 24 compliance does not address the proposed furniture warehouse Project's energy impacts. The energy effects of the Project are, by definition, peculiar to the Project. Given the vast expanse of roofing provided by the proposed Project, any evaluation of its energy impacts cannot ignore the obvious feasibility of an array of solar panels on the roof or covering the extensive parking proposed at the site. Energy efficiency, in the context of the Proposed project and site would require the consideration and implementation of sufficient solar panels to meet all of the Project's direct electricity demand, as well as solar power that would offset the considerable GHG and other air pollution emissions that will result from the thousands of trucks and cars driving to and from the Project every day once it's operational.

The Environmental Checklist contains no discussion of the project's cost effectiveness in terms of energy requirements. There is no discussion of energy consuming equipment and processes that will be used during the construction or operation of the project. The project's energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction and operation were not identified. The effect of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity has not been addressed. As such, the Environmental Checklist's conclusions are unsupported by the necessary discussions of the Project's energy impacts under CEQA and the City lacks substantial evidence to exempt the Project under Section 15183.

## IV. The City Must Prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The 2022 General Plan Update concluded that several of the impacts identified as a result of the General Plan Update project were significant and unavoidable. These impacts included agricultural resources, air quality, greenhouse gas, and traffic noise impacts. In the Environmental Checklist prepared for the Project, the City acknowledges these significant and unavoidable impacts, but states that:

Impacts from buildout of the General Plan including cumulative impacts associated with development and buildout of the CLSP Phase 2 plan area and the warehouse Project site, as proposed, were fully addressed in the General Plan EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2021100139), and implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new or altered impacts beyond those addressed in the General Plan EIR.
(Envt'l Checklist, p. 13.) Similar statements are repeated for each of the specific unavoidable significant impacts. This conclusion does not, however, address all of the City's obligations to grapple with acknowledged significant and unavoidable cumulative
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impacts.
In the case of Communities for a Better Environment v. Cal. Resources Agency, the court of appeal held that, although tiering may allow a later project to rely on the environmental analysis contained in a prior program-level EIR, that procedure does not relieve the agency of acknowledging the significant and unavoidable impacts and reconsidering its statement of overriding considerations. As the Court explained:

The section appears to allow an agency, in approving a later project that has significant unavoidable impacts, to forego making a statement of overriding considerations specifically tied to that project. This is contrary to CEQA law. CEQA section 21094, subdivision (d) requires agencies that approve a later project to comply with CEQA section 21081. Under CEQA section 21081, an agency approving a project with significant environmental effects must find that each effect will be mitigated or avoided, or "that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the ... effect[] ...." The requirement of a statement of overriding considerations is central to CEQA's role as a public accountability statute; it requires public officials, in approving environmentally detrimental projects, to justify their decisions based on counterbalancing social, economic or other benefits, and to point to substantial evidence in support. Under Guidelines section 15152(f)(3)(C), however, an agency apparently could adopt one statement of overriding considerations for a prior, more general EIR, and then avoid future political accountability by approving later, more specific projects with significant unavoidable impacts pursuant to the prior EIR and statement of overriding considerations. Even though a prior EIR's analysis of environmental effects may be subject to being incorporated in a later EIR for a later, more specific project, the responsible public officials must still go on the record and explain specifically why they are approving the later project despite its significant unavoidable impacts.
(Communities for a Better Env't v. California Res. Agency (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 124-25.).
The same reasoning applies to the implementation of Section 15183. The Project, based on its reliance on the 2022 GP EIR, will have cumulative impacts on agricultural resources, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic noise. Although sections 21083 and 15183 provide for streamlining of the environmental review of a subsequent project, neither section relieves the City from its obligation to make a statement of overriding considerations for the Project. (PRC § 21081.) Thus, the City must prepare a statement of overriding considerations-supported by substantial evidence and evaluating whether any additional feasible mitigation measures applicable to this specific project- prior to approval of the Project.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above the Project does not qualify for an exemption from CEQA under
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Section 15183 and, the City must prepare an EIR or, if appropriate, a mitigated negative declaration for the Project prior to approval.

Sincerely,
Brionßyym
Brian B. Flynn
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

## EXHIBIT A

Shawn Smallwood, PhD
3108 Finch Street
Davis, CA 95616
Attn: Rick Caguiat, Director of Community Development The City of Lathrop 390 Towne Centre Dr
Lathrop, CA 95330
1 October 2023
RE: Ashley Warehouse Project
Dear Mr. Caguiat,
I write to comment on potential impacts to biological resources that could result from the Ashley Warehouse Project. I reviewed an Environmental Checklist prepared for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) Phase 2 Update, and Ashley Warehouse Project, and a biological resources assessment prepared by Olberding (2021). I understand the project would construct a $1,486,607$ square-foot building up to 60 feet in height and 943 vehicle spaces, and 1,104 trailer spaces/stalls on 89.92 acres of what used to be in dryland agriculture, but which over the past decade has been unfarmed but repeatedly disced, leaving patches of ruderal grassland unreached by the discing assembly. I am concerned that the project would cause significant impacts to multiple special-status species of wildlife and to wildlife in general, and that the impacts would be insufficiently mitigated with participation in the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP), which is failing to conserve its covered species (see below). I am concerned that exemptions per CEQA Guidelines $\S 15183$ do not apply to this site nor to this project.

My qualifications for preparing expert comments are the following. I hold a Ph.D. degree in Ecology from University of California at Davis, where I also worked as a postgraduate researcher in the Department of Agronomy and Range Sciences. My research has been on animal density and distribution, habitat selection, wildlife interactions with the anthrosphere, and conservation of rare and endangered species. I authored many papers on these and other topics. I served as Chair of the Conservation Affairs Committee for The Wildlife Society - Western Section. I am a member of The Wildlife Society and Raptor Research Foundation, and I've lectured part-time at California State University, Sacramento. I was Associate Editor of wildlife biology's premier scientific journal, The Journal of Wildlife Management, as well as of Biological Conservation, and I was on the Editorial Board of Environmental Management. I have performed wildlife surveys in California for thirty-seven years. My CV is attached.

## SITE VISIT

I visited the site of the proposed project for 2.55 hours from 06:53 to 09:26 hours on 21 September 2023. I scanned for wildlife with use of binoculars from the roads bordering the site. I recorded all species of vertebrate wildlife I detected, including those whose members flew over the site or were seen adjacent to the site. Animals of uncertain
species identity were either omitted or recorded to a higher taxonomic level. Weather was sunny with no wind and $55-65^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. The site was mostly disced, and otherwise covered by ruderal annal grassland (Photos 1-3).


Photos 1-3. The project site on 21 September 2023, depicting at top the trees (at left) where Swainson's hawks nested, at middle a raised area that could not be disced, and at bottom a patch of elderberry on the project site's west side.

Despite the disturbed nature of the project site, I detected 35 species of vertebrate wildlife, including 10 special-status species (Table 1). On the site were at least 3 Swainson's hawks (Photo 4), which is a threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act. The repeatedly landed on a nest located on the south side of Dos Reis Road. I also found red-tailed hawks (Photo 5) loggerhead shrikes (Photos 6 and 7), lesser goldfinches, Brewer's blackbirds and house finches (Photos 8-10), and California ground squirrels (Photos 11 and 12).

Table 1. Species of wildlife I observed during 2.55 hours of survey on 21 September 2023.

| Common name | Species name | Status ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| White-throated swift | Aeronautes saxatalis |  | Foraged |
| Rock pigeon | Columba livia | Non-native | Foraged |
| Eurasian collared-dove | Streptopelia decaocto | Non-native | Foraged |
| Mourning dove | Zenaida macroura |  | Foraged |
| Killdeer | Charadrius vociferus |  | Foraged |
| California gull | Larus californicus | BCC, TWL | Flyovers |
| Double-crested cormorant | Nannopterum auritum | TWL | Flyover |
| Snowy egret | Egretta thula |  | Flyover |
| Turkey vulture | Cathartes aura | BOP | Foraged |
| White-tailed kite | Elanus leucurus | CFP, BOP | Called |
| Cooper's hawk | Accipiter cooperii | TWL, BOP | Harassed by kestrels |
| Swainson's hawk | Buteo swainsoni | CT, BOP | Foraged |
| Red-tailed hawk | Buteo jamaicensis | BOP | Foraged |
| Great horned owl | Bubo virginianus | BOP | Pellets |
| American kestrel | Falco sparverius | BOP | Foraged |
| Black phoebe | Sayornis nigricans |  | Foraged |
| Say's phoebe | Sayornis saya | Foraged |  |
| Loggerhead shrike | Lanius ludovicianus | SSC2 | Foraged |
| California scrub-jay | Aphelocoma californica |  | Foraged |
| American crow | Corvus brachyrhynchos |  | Foraged |
| Horned lark | Eremophila alpestris |  | Flyover |
| Barn swallow | Hirundo rustica |  | Foraged |
| American pipit | Anthus rubescens |  | Foraged |
| Northern mockingbird | Mimus polyglottos |  | Foraged |
| European starling | Sturnus vulgaris | Non-native | Foraged |
| House finch | Haemorphous mexicanus |  | Foraged |
| Lesser goldfinch | Spinus psaltria |  | Foraged |
| Western meadowlark | Sturnella neglecta |  | Foraged |
| Red-winged blackbird | Agelaius phoeniceus |  | Flyovers |
| Brewer's blackbird | Euphagus cyanocephalus |  | Foraged |
| Desert cottontail | Sylvilagus audubonii |  | Tracks |
| California ground squirrel | Otospermophilus beecheyi |  |  |
| Coyote | Canis latrans |  | Burrows |
| Kangaroo rat | Dipodomys |  |  |
| Botta's pocket gopher | Thomomys bottae |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Listed as CT $=$ California threatened, CFP = California Fully Protected (CFG Code 3511), SSC2 $=$ California Species of Special Concern priority level 2, BCC = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Bird of Conservation Concern, TWL = Taxa to Watch List (Shuford and Gardali 2008), and BOP = Birds of Prey (California Fish and Game Code 3503.5).


Photo 4. One of at least three Swainson's hawk foraging on the project site, 21 September 2023.

Photo 5. One of two redtailed hawks on the project site, 21 September 2023, although this photo was taken of the hawk just south of the site.


Photos 6 and 7. Loggerhead shrikes on the project site, 21 September 2023. In the left photo, a Say's phoebe is flying in the immediate foreground.


Photos 8-10. Lesser goldfinch and Brewer's blackbird (top), and house finches (bottom) on the project site, 21 September 2023.


Photo 11. Burrows of California ground squirrel on the project site, 21 September 2023.

Photos 12. A California ground squirrel located adjacent to the project site, 21 September 2023.


What I found at the project site qualifies as an exception to CEQA Guidelines $\S 15183$ regarding exemptions to additional environmental review. Considering the site's condition and what I have found at 55 other sites throughout California that were of similar condition, the relatively large number of species I detected, and especially the number of special-status species I detected, should the project go forward as proposed, it would result in impacts peculiar to the parcel on which the project would be located. What I found at the project site is a rate of species' detections that exceeded the $95 \%$ confidence interval derived from similar reconnaissance surveys I completed at 55 other sites (Figure 1). The project site is inherently rich in wildlife, especially in special-status species of wildlife.


Figure 1. Actual (circles) and predicted (line) relationship between the number of vertebrate wildlife species detected and the elapsed survey time based on my visualscan surveys on 21 September 2023, and compared to the $95 \%$ CI of 55 surveys I completed at sites proposed for projects throughout California that had similarly been intensively and extensively disturbed in manners to suppress wildlife occurrences. The arrow points to the place on the graph which corresponds with the time it took me to find the same number of vertebrate wildlife species as reportedly detected by Olberding (2021) on 5 May 2021.

My surveys provide evidence of the project site's exceptional habitat value to wildlife, but additional value can be inferred from my data. Reconnaissance surveys, such as the survey I completed, can be useful for confirming presence of species that were detected, but they can also be useful for estimating the number of species that were not detected. One can model the pattern in species detections during a survey as a means to estimate the number of species that used the site but were undetected during the survey. But whereas this modeling approach is useful for more realistically representing the species richness of the site at the time of a survey, such as in Figure 1, it cannot represent the species richness throughout the year or across multiple years because many species are seasonal or even multi-annual in their movement patterns and in their occupancy of habitat. Multiple surveys are needed to inventory the species that make use of a site over the period of a year or longer.

By use of an analytical bridge, a modeling effort applied to a large, robust data set from a research site can predict the number of vertebrate wildlife species that likely make use of the site over the longer term. As part of my research, I completed a much larger survey effort across $167 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ of annual grasslands of the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area, where from 2015 through 2019 I performed 721 1-hour visual-scan surveys, or 721 hours of surveys, at 46 stations. I used binoculars and otherwise the methods were the same as the methods I and other consulting biologists use for surveys at proposed project sites. At each of the 46 survey stations, I tallied new species detected with each sequential survey at that station, and then related the cumulative species detected to the hours (number of surveys, as each survey lasted 1 hour) used to accumulate my counts of species detected. I used combined quadratic and simplex methods of estimation in Statistica to estimate least-squares, best-fit nonlinear models of the number of cumulative species detected regressed on hours of survey (number of surveys) at the station: $\hat{R}=\frac{1}{1 / a+b \times(\text { Hours })^{c}}$, where $\hat{R}$ represented cumulative species richness detected. The coefficients of determination, $r^{2}$, of the models ranged 0.88 to 1.00 , with a mean of 0.97 ( $95 \%$ CI: $0.96,0.98$ ); or in other words, the models were excellent fits to the data.

I projected the predictions of each model to thousands of hours to find predicted asymptotes of wildlife species richness. The mean model-predicted asymptote of species richness was 57 after 11,857 hours of visual-scan surveys among the 46 stations of my research site. I also averaged model predictions of species richness at each incremental increase of number of surveys, i.e., number of hours (Figure 2). On average I detected 11.2 species over the first 2.55 hours of surveys at my research site in the Altamont Pass ( 2.55 hours to match the 2.55 hours I surveyed at the project site), which composed $19.65 \%$ of the predicted total number of species I would detect with a much larger survey effort at the research site. Given the example illustrated in Figure 2, the 35 species I detected after my 2.55 hours of survey at the project site likely represented $19.65 \%$ of the species to be detected after many more visual-scan surveys over another year or longer. With many more repeat surveys through the year, I would likely detect $35 / 0.1965=178$ species of vertebrate wildlife at the site. Assuming my ratio of specialstatus to non-special-status species was to hold through the detections of all 178 predicted species, then continued surveys would eventually detect 51 special-status species of vertebrate wildlife.

Figure 2. Mean ( $95 \%$ CI) predicted wildlife species richness, $\hat{R}$, as a nonlinear function of hour-long survey increments across 46 visual-scan survey stations across the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, 2015-2019. Note that the location of the study is largely irrelevant to the utility of the graph to the interpretation of survey outcomes at the project site. It is the pattern in the data that is relevant, because the pattern is typical of the pattern seen elsewhere.


Again, however, my prediction of 178 species of vertebrate wildlife, including 51 specialstatus species of vertebrate wildlife, is derived from daytime visual-scan surveys, and would not detect nocturnal mammals such as bats. The true number of species composing the wildlife community of the site must be larger. A reconnaissance survey should serve only as a starting point toward characterization of a site's wildlife community, but it certainly cannot alone inform of the inventory of species that use the site. More surveys are needed. Nevertheless, the large number of species I predict at the project site is exceptional, and in my experience with many reconnaissance surveys in California, the species richness at the site relative to its level of disturbance is peculiar to the site.

## EXISTING ENVIRNMENTAL SETTING

The first step in analysis of potential project impacts to biological resources is to accurately characterize the existing environmental setting, including the biological species that use the site, their relative abundances, how they use the site, key ecological relationships, and known and ongoing threats to those species with special status. A reasonably accurate characterization of the environmental setting can provide the basis for determining whether the site holds habitat value to wildlife, as well as a baseline against which to analyze potential project impacts. For these reasons, characterization of the environmental setting, including the project site's regional setting, is one of CEQA's essential analytical steps. Methods to achieve this first step typically include (1) surveys of the site for biological resources, and (2) reviews of literature, databases and local experts for documented occurrences of special-status species. In the case of the proposed project, these needed steps were grossly inadequate.

## Environmental Setting informed by Field Surveys

To CEQA's primary objective to disclose potential environmental impacts of a proposed project, the analysis should be informed of which biological species are known to occur at the proposed project site, which special-status species are likely to occur, as well as the limitations of the survey effort directed to the site. Analysts need this information to characterize the environmental setting as a basis for opining on, or predicting, potential project impacts to biological resources.

Olberding (2021) incompletely reports on the reconnaissance survey that was completed at the project site. Although the survey date is reported (5 May 2021), Olberding (2021) does not report what time of day the survey began, nor the survey's duration. These are critical omissions that prevent the reader from understanding the survey outcome.

Olberding (2021) did not achieve the minimum standards for reconnaissance survey directed toward plants (CDFW 2018). Olberding's (2021) conclusions regarding the unlikely occurrences of special-status species of plants therefore lack adequate foundation in survey.

The findings of the Olberding (2021) are largely unreliable. Olberding (2021) managed to detect only six species of vertebrate wildlife, which is the number of vertebrate wildlife species I detected within two minutes from the start of my survey on 21 September 2023 (see the arrow in Figure 1). After 2.55 hours, I detected nearly six times the number of species of vertebrate wildlife as did Olberding (2021), and the pattern in the data indicate I would have detected many more species had I continued the survey (Figure 1). Whereas Olberding (2021) saw three special-status species, I saw ten of them. Olberding (2021) missed the great horned owl pellets that I found under nearly every span of electric distribution lines. Olberding (2021) missed the kangaroo rat burrow systems, and the Botta's pocket gopher burrow systems, both types of burrows of which are readily visible. Furthermore, Olberding (2021) saw no bird smaller than a white-tailed kite, whereas I saw 22 such species. Perhaps because the survey was too brief of for some other reason, Olberding (2021) saw and reported few of the vertebrate wildlife species that occur on the project site.

No surveys were completed for bats. Nor were any protocol-level detection surveys completed for special-status species despite known occurrences in the project area. No detection surveys were completed for burrowing owl and Swainson's hawk (I saw three on site). Swainson's hawks nested on a tree just across Dos Reis Road on the south side of the project site in 2021 (Olberding 2021) and probably again in 2023, based on my observations. And because ground squirrels occur on and around the project site, there is a reasonable likelihood that burrowing owls also occur on the site. Protocol-level detection surveys are available for these species (CDFW 2010, 2012), and should be implemented.

Olberding (2021) fails to accurately inform the Checklist of the wildlife community that is part of the existing environmental setting. Olberding's (2021) reporting was deficient, and the surveys were grossly incomplete and unreliable.

## Environmental Setting informed by Desktop Review

The purpose of literature and database review and of consulting with local experts is to inform the reconnaissance survey, to augment interpretation of its outcome, and to help determine which protocol-level detection surveys should be implemented. Analysts need this information to identify which species are known to have occurred at or near the project site, and to identify which other special-status species could conceivably occur at the site due to geographic range overlap and site conditions. This step is important because the reconnaissance survey is not going to detect all of the species of wildlife that make use of the site over a period of a year or longer. This step can identity those species yet to be detected at the site but which have been documented to occur nearby or whose available habitat associations are consistent with site conditions. Some special-status species can be ruled out of further analysis, but only if compelling evidence is available in support of such determinations.

Olberding (2021) provides an inadequate database or desktop review. The desktop review neglects iNaturalist and eBird as data sources. It provides no evidence that local experts were consulted for knowledge of occurrences of special-status species in the project area. The methodology for selecting special-status species for analysis of occurrence likelihoods was flawed (see below).

By including in the species' likelihood of occurrence analysis only species whose documented occurrences within the nearest CNDDB quadrangles, Olberding (2021) screens out many special-status species from further consideration in the characterization of the wildlife community as part of the baseline environmental setting. CNDDB is not designed to support absence determinations or to screen out species from characterization of a site's wildlife community. As noted by CNDDB, "The CNDDB is a positive sighting database. It does not predict where something may be found. We map occurrences only where we have documentation that the species was found at the site. There are many areas of the state where no surveys have been conducted and therefore there is nothing on the map. That does not mean that there are no special status species present." Olberding (2021) misuses CNDDB.

CNDDB relies entirely on volunteer reporting from biologists who were allowed access to whatever properties they report from. Many properties have never been surveyed by biologists. Many properties have been surveyed, but the survey outcomes never reported to CNDDB. Many properties have been surveyed multiple times, but not all survey outcomes reported to CNDDB. Furthermore, CNDDB is interested only in the findings of special-status species, which means that species more recently assigned special status will have been reported many fewer times to CNDDB than were species assigned special status since the inception of CNDDB. The lack of many CNDDB records for species recently assigned special status had nothing to do with whether the species' geographic ranges overlapped the project site, but rather more to do with the brief time for records to have accumulated since the species were assigned special status. And because negative findings are not reported to CNDDB, CNDDB cannot provide the basis for estimating occurrence likelihoods, either.

In my assessment based on database reviews and site visits, 107 special-status species of wildlife are known to occur near enough to the site to warrant analysis of occurrence potential (Table 2). Of these 107 species, 10 ( $9 \%$ ) were recorded on site, and another 22 ( $21 \%$ ) species have been documented within 1.5 miles of the site ('Very close'), another 19 ( $18 \%$ ) within 1.5 and 4 miles ('Nearby'), and another 46 ( $43 \%$ ) within 4 to 30 miles ('In region'). Nearly half ( $48 \%$ ) of the species in Table 2 have been reportedly seen within 4 miles of the project site. The site therefore supports multiple special-status species of wildlife and carries the potential for supporting many more special-status species of wildlife based on proximity of recorded occurrences.

Because the project would attempt to mitigate its impacts to wildlife by participating with the SJMSCP, it is important to analyze the occurrence likelihoods of SJMSCPcovered species. Of the 107 special-status species in Table 2, $36(34 \%)$ are covered by the SJMSCP, including 5 that I observed on the project site, 10 with known occurrences very close, 7 nearby, and 10 in the region. Of the 36 SJMSCP-covered species, the occurrence likelihoods of only 12 are analyzed by Olberding (2021), including 2 that Olberding (2021) observed on site, and determinations by Olberding (2021) that 1 may occur on site, 3 are unlikely, and 6 are presumed absent. In summary, only a third of the specialstatus species in Table 2 are covered by the SJMSCP, $67 \%$ of which have been recorded within 4 miles of the project site, and only $33 \%$ of which have been analyzed in support of the Checklist.

Because the project would attempt to mitigate its impacts to wildlife by participating with the SJMSCP, it is also important to analyze the occurrence likelihoods of specialstatus species that are not covered by the SJMSCP. In fact, for these species, it is even more important to analyze their occurrence likelihoods because the mitigation of the SJMSCP was not formulated with these species in mind. Of the 107 special-status species that are listed in Table 2, 71 (66\%) are not covered by the SJMSCP, including 5 that I observed on site, and occurrence records of 12 that are very close, 12 nearby, and 36 in the region. Of 71 the special-status species in table 2 that not covered by the SJMSCP, Olberding (2021) analyzes the occurrence likelihoods of only 8 (11\%), including of none that I observed on site, and determinations by Olberding (2021) of 2 as unlikely and 6 as presumed absent. Of the latter 6 species Olberding (2021) presumed absent, 2 have been recorded very close to the project site (yellow-headed blackbird and Modesto song sparrow only 0.46 miles away). In summary, two-thirds of the specialstatus species in Table 2 are not covered by the SJMSCP, 29 ( $41 \%$ ) of which have been recorded within 4 miles of the project site, and only $8(11 \%)$ of which have been analyzed in support of the Checklist. Except for my own assessments in Table 2, the Checklist is grossly inadequate in its characterization of that part of the wildlife community that lacks coverage under the SJMSCP.
Table 2. Occurrence likelihoods of special-status bird species at or near the proposed project site, according to eBird/iNaturalist of the site, "nearby" indicates within 1.5 and 4 miles, and "in region" indicates within 4 and 30 miles, and 'in range' means the

| species' geographic range overlaps the site. Records in bold font indicate those species I detected. |  | SJMSCP <br> covered <br> species | Checklist <br> occurrrence <br> potential | Databased, <br> Site visits |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Common name | Species name |  |  |  |


| Common name | Species name | Status ${ }^{1}$ | SJMSCP <br> covered species | Checklist occurrence potential | Databased, Site visits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black-chinned sparrow | Spizella atrogularis | BCC |  |  | In region |
| Bell's sparrow | Amphispiza b. belli | WL | Yes |  | In region |
| Oregon vesper sparrow | Pooecetes gramineus affinis | SSC2, BCC |  |  | In range |
| Yellow-breasted chat | Icteria virens | SSC3 | Yes |  | Nearby |
| Yellow-headed blackbird | Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus | $\mathrm{SSC}_{3}$ |  | Absent | Very close |
| Bullock's oriole | Icterus bullockii | BCC |  |  | Very close |
| Tricolored blackbird | Agelaius tricolor | CT, BCC, SSC1 | Yes | Absent | Very close |
| Lucy's warbler | Leiothlypis luciae | SSC3, BCC |  |  | In region |
| Virginia's warbler | Leiothlypis virginiae | WL, BCC |  |  | In region |
| Yellow warbler | Setophaga petechia | SSC2 | Yes |  | Very close |
| Summer tanager | Piranga rubra | SSC1 |  |  | In region |
| Pallid bat | Antrozous pallidus | SSC, WBWG:H |  | Unlikely | In range |
| Townsend's big-eared bat | Corynorhinus townsendii | SSC, WBWG:H | Yes | Absent | In range |
| Canyon bat | Parastrellus hesperus | WBWG:L |  |  | In region |
| Big brown bat | Episticus fuscus | WBWG:L |  |  | In range |
| Silver-haired bat | Lasionycteris noctivagans | WBWG:M |  |  | In range |
| Western red bat | Lasiurus blossevillii | SSC, WBWG:H | Yes |  | In region |
| Hoary bat | Lasiurus cinereus | WBWG:M |  |  | In region |
| Western small-footed myotis | Myotis cililabrum | WBWG:M | Yes |  | In range |
| Little brown myotis | Myotis lucifugus | WBWG:M |  |  | In region |
| Yuma myotis | Myotis yumanensis | WBWG:LM | Yes |  | In range |
| California myotis | Myotis californicus | WBWG:L |  |  | In range |
| American badger | Taxidea taxus | SSC |  | Absent | In region | Listed as FT or $\mathrm{FE}=$ federal threatened or endangered, $\mathrm{FC}=$ federal candidate for listing, $\mathrm{BCC}=\mathrm{U}$. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Bird of Conservation Concern, CT or CE = California threatened or endangered, CCT or or endangered, CFP = California Fully Protected (California Fish and Game Code 3511 ), SSC mout range peripheral portion of Concern (not threatened with extinction, but rare, very restricted in range, ( Concern priorities 1, 2 and 3, respectively (Shuford and Gardali 2008), WL = Taxa to Watch List (Shuford and Gardali 2008)

and BOP = Birds of Prey (CFG Code 3503.5), and WBWG = Western Bat Working Group with priority rankings, of low (L), moderate (M), and high (H)

## Habitat Assessment

Olberding (2021) speculates that "Due to the heavily disturbed nature of the Property there were a limited number of wildlife species observed during the survey." However, the heavy disturbance was much less limiting to the number of wildlife species that I detected on the project site, as I found nearly 6 times the number reported by Olberding (2021). This noted, the project site has been intensively disturbed over a number of years, and this level of disturbance undoubtedly diminished the species of wildlife species that occur on the site as compared to times preceding the repeated discing of the site. Nevertheless, wildlife strive to survive, even where conditions are far from ideal. Some species often fare better on disturbed soils. Horned larks and killdeer are perfectly capable of nesting on the ground of the project site. American pipits, American crows, house finches and red-winged blackbirds often forage on disced soil, and these birds are in turn pursued by Swainson's hawks, Cooper's hawks and white-tailed kites, among others. Swainson's hawks are known for foraging over disturbed fields, especially as the fields are being disturbed by activities such as discing (Smallwood 1995, Smallwood et al. 1996, Swolgaard et al. 2008). Swainson's hawks nested adjacent to the project site for good reasons. The disturbance of a site is no justification for dismissing it as valuable to wildlife (Smallwood and Smallwood 2023).

For multiple species, Olberding (2021) speculates that the project site is unsuitable as nesting habitat and therefore is unlikely to cause significant impacts if it is developed. However, there is no sound scientific distinction between nesting habitat and some other characterization of habitat. For any given species, the environment of a site is either habitat or it is not, as habitat is defined as that part of the environment that is used by a species (Hall et al. 1997). Certain portions of a species' habitat may provide nesting opportunities, but all parts of its habitat are critical to the nesting success of members of the species. If an animal cannot find sufficient forage and cover during nonnesting season or at portions of its habitat where it does not normally nest, then it might not survive to reproduce or its nesting attempt might not succeed. Olberding (2021) asserts a false distinction of the value of a site based on whether the species nests onsite.

The above-arguments were applied to loggerhead shrike, which serves as a good example of how poorly predictive the Olberding's (2021) approach is to determining occurrence likelihood. Olberding (2021) determines loggerhead shrike to have a low likelihood of occurrence due to lack of trees and shrubs needed for nesting. However, loggerhead shrikes are resourceful when it comes to finding and using nest substrate (Smallwood and Smallwood 2021). Furthermore, elderberry shrubs occur on the project site (Photo 3) as do loggerhead shrikes (Table 1, Photos 6 and 7). When I arrived at the project site to perform my survey, I expected to see loggerhead shrikes, based on my experience. The occurrence likelihood of loggerhead shrike was not low, and the same can be concluded for many of the other special-status species considered by Olberding (2021).

## POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL IMPACTS

An impacts analysis should consider whether and how a proposed project would affect members of a species, larger demographic units of the species, the whole of a species, and ecological communities. The accuracy of this analysis depends on an accurate characterization of the existing environmental setting. In the case of the proposed project, the existing environmental setting has not been accurately characterized, and several important types of potential project impact have not been analyzed. These types of impacts include habitat loss, interference with wildlife movement, and collision mortality with solar PV panels and project-generated traffic.

## HABITAT LOSS

The project would destroy 89.92 acres of habitat to every species of wildlife that makes use of the project site. My survey outcomes interpreted with the help of an analytical bridge to more extensive research at another site in a similar environment predict 178 species of vertebrate wildlife would eventually be detected by repeat visual-scan surveys similar those I completed. Added to these 178 species would be all the nocturnal species I would unlikely detect during the daytime, such as species of bat, multiple species of small mammal, American badger and perhaps San Joaquin kit fox. What remains without analysis is the magnitude of loss of the numbers of animals that can be produced by the project site.

In the case of birds, two methods exist for estimating the loss of productive capacity that would be caused by the project. One method would involve surveys to count the number of bird nests and chicks produced. The alternative method is to infer productive capacity from estimates of total nest density elsewhere. I am aware of estimates of total nest density elsewhere, but none were on fields that underwent discing every year except for a field I surveyed for total nest density this past spring. The field had been a walnut orchard in Rancho Cordova, California, but the walnuts were abandoned while the floor continued to be disced, sometimes entirely and sometimes partially. I surveyed the 12.74-acre study site 30 times from March through the first half of August to estimate total nest density. Total nest density of birds was 14.38 nests per acre, but this density included cavity nests and tree-supported cup nests within the scattering of abandoned orchard walnuts. Excluding the cavity nests and tree-supported cup nests, total nest density on the ground and in elderberry shrubs was 2.12 nests/acre. Assuming that the estimates of total bird nest density on the ground and in elderberry was similar between my study site and the project site, then the project site likely supports 191 nests per year.

The loss of 191 nest sites of birds would qualify as a potentially significant project impact, but the impact does not end with the immediate loss of nest sites as nest substrate is removed and foraging grounds graded in preparation for impervious surfaces. The reproductive capacity of the site would be lost. The average number of fledglings per nest in Young's (1948) study was 2.9. Assuming Young's (1948) study site typifies bird productivity, the project would prevent the production of 554 fledglings per year. Assuming an average bird generation time of 5 years, the lost capacity of both breeders and annual fledgling production can be estimated from an equation in

Smallwood (2022): \{(nests/year $\times$ chicks/nest $\times$ number of years) $+(2$ adults $/$ nest $\times$ nests/year) $\times$ (number of years $\div$ years $/$ generation $)\} \div$ (number of years) $=630$ birds per year denied to California. In the face of a potential project impact of this magnitude, I conclude that the potential project impacts to the productive capacity of birds would be significant.

## INTERFERENCE WITH WILDLIVE MOVEMENT

The analysis of whether the project would interfere with wildlife movement in the regio is flawed and misleading. According to the Checklist, "The Biological Resources Analysis Report (Attachment A) [Olberding 2021] included a CNDDB record search that did not reveal any documented wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites on or adjacent to warehouse site." However, CNDDB is not where an analyst would find information relevant to whether a site is important to wildlife movement. Nor did Olberding (2021) address the issue of wildlife movement in the region. In effect, there is no analysis of whether the project would interfere with wildlife movement.

The Checklist also claims that the impact on wildlife movement corridors was adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR. Indeed, the General Plan EIR addresses wildife movement corridors, but it does so with a focus on the San Joaquin River as a wildlife corridor, and it does so with a focus solely on the functionality of corridors. The General Plan EIR implies the premise that interference with wildlife movement in the region can result only from a project's disruption of the function of a wildlife movement corridor. This premise represents a false CEQA standard, and was therefore inappropriate to the analysis. The primary phrase of the CEQA standard goes to wildlife movement regardless of whether the movement is channeled by a corridor. A site such as the project site is critically important for wildlife movement because it composes an increasingly diminishing area of open space within a growing expanse of anthropogenic uses, forcing more species of volant wildlife to use the site for stopover and staging during migration, dispersal, and home range patrol (Warnock 2010, Taylor et al. 2011, Runge et al. 2014).

In any case, many of the animals I saw on the project site got there by moving there from someplace else, and others were using the airspace of the site as a travel medium. California gulls flew across the site, as did snowy egrets, double-crested cormorants, mourning doves, horned larks and many other birds. To and from the project site, pocket gophers disperse along linear elements of the landscape (Smallwood et al. 2001), and so do kangaroo rats; otherwise, these species would have been extirpated from the site long ago due to the discing. The project site includes grassland patches to and from which many species of wildlife are compelled to travel, and the majority of the site in disturbed soil likely serves as an island of open space in the winter months for stopover by mountain plovers, merlin, ferruginous hawks and many other special-status species.

The Checklist fails to analyze whether and to what degree the project's 60 -foot-tall building and adjoining impervious surface covering nearly 90 acres would interfere with wildlife movement in the region, and whether the resulting impacts could be mitigated.

## TRAFFIC IMPACTS TO WILDLIFE

For the following reasons, the project would qualify as an exception to CEQA Guidelines $\S 15183$ regarding exemptions to additional environmental review: 1) project-generated traffic impacts to wildlife were mentioned as a bullet item but not analyzed as significant effects in the Lathrop General Plan EIR, and 2) the project-generated traffic impacts to wildlife would be potentially significant off-site and they would contribute cumulatively to traffic impacts to wildlife impacts generated by other projects in the region, and which were not discussed in the Lathrop General Plan EIR. The Lathrop General Plan EIR's only mention of traffic impacts to wildlife was "Significant impacts on special status species associated with individual subsequent projects could include: increased mortality caused by higher numbers of automobiles in new areas of development." This is a statement, but not an analysis, and it was followed by no policies or actions to minimize the impacts.

The Checklist fails to address one of the project's most obvious, substantial impacts to wildlife, and that is wildlife mortality and injuries caused by project-generated traffic. Project-generated traffic would endanger wildlife that must, for various reasons, cross roads used by the project's traffic (Photos 13-15), including along roads far from the project footprint. Vehicle collisions have accounted for the deaths of many thousands of amphibian, reptile, mammal, bird, and arthropod fauna, and the impacts have often been found to be significant at the population level (Forman et al. 2003). Across North America traffic impacts have taken devastating tolls on wildlife (Forman et al. 2003). In Canada, 3,562 birds were estimated killed per 100 km of road per year (Bishop and Brogan 2013), and the US estimate of avian mortality on roads is 2,200 to 8,405 deaths per 100 km per year, or 89 million to 340 million total per year (Loss et al. 2014). Local impacts can be more intense than nationally.

Photo 13. A coyote uses the crosswalk to crosses a road on 2 February 2023.



Photos 14 and 15. Raccoon killed on Road 31 just east of Highway 505 in Solano County (left; photo taken on 10 November 2018), and mourning dove killed by vehicle on a California road (right; photo by Noriko Smallwood, 21 June 2020.)

The nearest study of traffic-caused wildlife mortality was performed along a 2.5 -mile stretch of Vasco Road o9nly 20 miles away in Contra Costa County, California. Fatality searches in this study found 1,275 carcasses of 49 species of mammals, birds, amphibians and reptiles over 15 months of searches (Mendelsohn et al. 2009). This fatality number needs to be adjusted for the proportion of fatalities that were not found due to scavenger removal and searcher error. This adjustment is typically made by placing carcasses for searchers to find (or not find) during their routine periodic fatality searches. This step was not taken at Vasco Road (Mendelsohn et al. 2009), but it was taken as part of another study next to Vasco Road (Brown et al. 2016). Brown et al.'s (2016) adjustment factors for carcass persistence resembled those of Santos et al. (2011). Also applying searcher detection rates from Brown et al. (2016), the adjusted total number of fatalities was estimated at 12,187 animals killed by traffic on the road. This fatality number over 1.25 years and 2.5 miles of road translates to 3,900 wild animals per mile per year. In terms comparable to the national estimates, the estimates from the Mendelsohn et al. (2009) study would translate to 243,740 animals killed per 100 km of road per year, or 29 times that of Loss et al.'s (2014) upper bound estimate and 68 times the Canadian estimate. An analysis is needed of whether increased traffic generated by the project site would similarly result in local impacts on wildlife.

For wildlife vulnerable to front-end collisions and crushing under tires, road mortality can be predicted from the study of Mendelsohn et al. (2009) as a basis, although it would be helpful to have the availability of more studies like that of Mendelsohn et al. (2009) at additional locations. My analysis of the Mendelsohn et al. (2009) data resulted in an estimated 3,900 animals killed per mile along a county road in Contra Costa County. Two percent of the estimated number of fatalities were birds, and the balance was composed of $34 \%$ mammals (many mice and pocket mice, but also ground squirrels, desert cottontails, striped skunks, American badgers, raccoons, and others), $52.3 \%$ amphibians (large numbers of California tiger salamanders and California red-
legged frogs, but also Sierran treefrogs, western toads, arboreal salamanders, slender salamanders and others), and $11.7 \%$ reptiles (many western fence lizards, but also skinks, alligator lizards, and snakes of various species). VMT is useful for predicting wildlife mortality because I was able to quantify miles traveled along the studied reach of Vasco Road during the time period of the Mendelsohn et al. (2009), hence enabling a rate of fatalities per VMT that can be projected to other sites, assuming similar collision fatality rates.

## Predicting project-generated traffic impacts to wildlife

The Checklist predicts 2,798 daily tips among 1,295 employees and a mean 15.43 daily VMT per employee. Assuming the daily trips are weekdays, the annual VMT not including weekend mileage would amount to $11,225,016$ annual VMT. During the Mendelsohn et al. (2009) study, 19,500 cars traveled Vasco Road daily, so the vehicle miles that contributed to my estimate of non-volant fatalities was 19,500 cars and trucks $\times 2.5$ miles $\times 365$ days $/$ year $\times 1.25$ years $=22,242,187.5$ vehicle miles per 12,187 wildlife fatalities, or 1,825 vehicle miles per fatality. This rate divided into the predicted annual VMT would predict 6,151 vertebrate wildlife fatalities per year. Even if the mortality turns out to be as low as half that of the Mendelsohn et al. (2009) study, the annual death toll to wildlife resulting from project-generated traffic would be 3,075, which would also qualify as a significant, unmitigated impact to wildlife caused by the project.

Based on my indicator-level analysis, the project-generated traffic would cause substantial, significant impacts to wildlife. The Checklist does not address this potential impact, let alone propose to mitigate it. Mitigation measures to improve wildlife safety along roads are available and are feasible, and they need exploration for their suitability with the proposed project. Given the predicted level of project-generated traffic-caused mortality, and the lack of any proposed mitigation, it is my opinion that the proposed project would result in potentially significant adverse biological impacts. The Checklist fails to analyze the impact of wildlife-automobile collisions resulting from projectgenerated traffic, and how to mitigate it.

## CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Because cumulative impacts are proving more severe than discussed in the Lathrop General Plan EIR, the project would be inconsistent with the CEQA Guideline $\$ 15183$ regarding exemptions to additional environmental review. According to the Checklist (p. 55), "The 2022 General Plan EIR determined that cumulative impacts to biological resources would be less than significant. ... As such, the proposed warehouse project is consistent with the adopted vision and uses identified within the General Plan, and would not result in any new or increased impacts associated with biological resources, beyond those that were already addressed in the 2022 Lathrop General Plan EIR. The proposed warehouse project would not result in a new or more severe impact than what was previously analyzed." The cumulative impacts analysis of the Lathrop General Plan EIR asserts that participation with the SJMSCP would prevent significant cumulative impacts. But it has not.

For example, burrowing owls have all but disappeared from the County, despite the SJMSCP. Over the past month (since 26 September 2023), there has only been one occurrence of burrowing owl in San Joaquin County that has been reported to eBird, and that was in Tracy. eBird Trends Analysis reveals an average 82\% decline in the area of the SJMSCP (Figure 3).

## Figure 3.
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## MITIGATION

## Requirement BIO-1: Participation with SJMSCP

The principal mitigation measure in the City's Checklist would be participation with the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP). Due to grossly deficient implementation and due to poor performance of the SJMSCP, the project's impacts to wildlife should be mitigated outside the SJMSCP. The SJMSCP is currently unsuitable as a mitigation strategy for the project. A projectspecific EIR needs to be prepared in order to formulate more effective mitigation. Below I explain why.

There are four major problems with relying on the SJMSCP to mitigate the project's impacts to special-status species of wildlife: (1) Not all special-status species at the site are covered by the SJMSCP; (2) Many non-covered species of birds are still protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Migratory Bird Protection Act (MBPA), which warrant CEQA review for potential impacts; (3) The SJMSCP requires protocol-level detection surveys at project sites for covered species, but no such surveys have been performed at the site of the proposed project; and, (4) Available evidence indicates that the premise is likely false that SJMSCP participation conserves covered species. These problems are discussed further below.
(1) Seventy-one ( $66 \%$ ) of the species in Table 2 are not covered by the SJMSCP. Four of the 10 special-status species that I saw on the project site are not covered by the SJMSCP. In other words, the SJMSCP insufficiently covers special-status species that would be adversely affected by the project. An important reason for this deficiency has been the continued assignments of special status to additional species as resource agencies have determined these species are declining or are in trouble. The growing list of special-status species is indicative of the effects of cumulative impacts. The SJMSCP failed to effectively prepare for the assignment of special status to so many more species, nor did it provide sufficient conservation benefits to prevent these assignments. Many species of wildlife have declined despite the SJMSCP.
(2) Any potentially occurring bird species protected by the MBTA and the MBPA warrants an impact assessment related to the proposed project, regardless of any additional special status. Ground-nesting birds nest on the project site, and tree-and shrub-nesting birds rely on the site for forage. Ground-nesters on the project site could include northern harrier, burrowing owl, and California horned lark among others. City of Lathrop needs to consider project impacts and mitigation for all bird species protected by the MBTA and MBPA.
(3) According to SJMSCP §5.2.2.1 (A), there is the requirement for "Preconstruction surveys to ... determine if SJMSCP Covered Species are present..." The purpose of these surveys, according to the SJMSCP §5.2.2.5, is to comply with existing protocols or guidelines for supporting a determination of species' absence as the standard, i.e., if the species is present, the surveys should detect it. In other words, although preconstruction survey normally refer to a clearance survey to avoid take by imminent use of heavy machinery to grade the project site, the SJMSCP requires protocol-level detection surveys. Such surveys are to be performed at project sites where habitat would be destroyed (SJMSCP §5.9.2.5). No detection surveys have been implemented at the site of the proposed project. A project-specific DEIR needs to be prepared, and it needs to include the results of detection surveys, including those meeting the guidelines of CDFW (2012) for burrowing owls and of CEC and CDFW (2010) for Swainson's hawks.
(4) The premise that project mitigation via SJMSCP fees will conserve special-status species lacks support of evidence, which is required in the SJMSCP and its Implementation Agreement.

The SJMSCP requires 'Pre-acquisition/Baseline surveys' at "potential or recently acquired SJMSCP Preserves" (SJMSCP §5.9.2.6). These surveys are characterized in the SJMSCP as detection surveys. Detection surveys are also required at proposed project sites. The SJMSCP also requires biological effectiveness monitoring at the Preserves, which are said to be needed to inform an adaptive management program. All of these surveys are intended to quantify the initial nexus between project impacts and conservation value in Preserves, and to enable managers to react to emerging deficiencies in this nexus. Monitoring biological effectiveness of the SJMSCP was supposed to be annual, whereas additional focused surveys of certain covered species were to be completed every three years. The SJMSCP also requires Annual Reports. A reasonable presumption is that the monitoring data in the Annual Reports were to be analyzed to inform adaptive management, but no such analysis has been presented during the first 23 years of the SJMSCP.

Detection Surveys at Project Sites.--In my experience in San Joaquin County, and based on my review of additional CEQA reviews in the County such as the River Project EIR and the Tracy 580 Business Park EIR, protocol-level detection surveys are rarely completed at sites of proposed new projects. The surveys that are completed are typically no more rigorous that reconnaissance-level surveys, which are unsuitable for supporting absence determinations of most animal species. Reconnaissance surveys are not detection surveys. Failure to adequately complete detection surveys as part of this step of the SJMSCP vastly diminishes the likelihood of quantifying the initial nexus between project impacts and conservation value in Preserves, and hampers the ability of managers to react to emerging deficiencies in this nexus.

Detection Surveys at New Preserves.--Baseline surveys were to be completed upon acquisition of each new Preserve, including a focused search for Swainson's hawk nests within 2 miles of the Preserve and additional focused surveys for SJMCP-covered species. The first evidence of baseline surveys having been completed was at four Preserves, as reported in the 2008 Annual Report. The 2008 Annual Report includes a list of wildlife species seen on the Rustan and Elworthy Preserves. However, no explanation is reported of how these species were detected, who performed the survey, on what date the surveys were completed, at what time the surveys were started, and for how long the surveys lasted and under what conditions. The reporting leaves the reader unable to ascertain whether many other species occurred on these Preserves but were undetected. I could find no evidence that the Baseline surveys at new Preserves qualified as detection surveys. Failure to adequately complete this step of the SJMSCP vastly diminishes the likelihood of quantifying the initial nexus between project impacts and conservation value in Preserves, and hampers the ability of managers to react to emerging deficiencies in this nexus.

Biological effectiveness monitoring.--Noriko Smallwood helped me to review the SJMSCP's Annual Reports that are available online at https://www.sjcog.org/ DocumentCenter/Index/15. Noriko entered data into electronic spreadsheets, which I later analyzed. We also found, in the process of reviewing the reports and processing and analyzing their data, that the Annual Reports reveal flawed study design, deficient implementation, and poor reporting, including poor quality control. Annual Reports
failed to include the results of biological effectiveness monitoring over the first five years of the certified SJMSCP. The Annual Report for 2012 is missing. The names of Preserves are inconsistent from Annual Report to Annual Report, so anyone attempting to compare survey results by year must carefully investigate the names of Preserves in order to record them consistently in database form. No trend analysis has been performed over 23 years of the SJMSCP. Because none of the Annual Reports compares biological effects monitoring among Preserves or among years, it is up to the reader to do so.

Reporting of survey results, and specifically of which wildlife species were detected, was in paragraph form for a decade, before switching to tables of results in 2015. Prior to 2015, some Annual Reports included counts of all wildlife species, whereas others included counts only of SJMSCP-covered species (2011). Annual Reports of 2008-2010 included counts of all species at certain Preserves and only covered species at other Preserves. Beginning in 2013, Annual Reports included counts of all species of wildlife, but the 2020 Annual Report only recorded the presence of those species detected by survey personnel. It was not until 2015 when all vertebrate species detections were recorded in Tables, although the referenced Table in the 2016 Annual Report does not actually appear in the Annual Report and was unavailable to us. It was not until 2015 when species counts and records of species detections qualified as comparable between years, as counts and records of presence numbered only fractions of what was reported after 2014, even including counts and records of presence of SJMSCP-covered species.

Other than the date of each survey, little of the survey methods is reported. Survey personnel are not identified. The survey method is characterized as "windshield surveys" on available roads that abut or cross the subject property, but there is no reported standard survey effort to adjust for variation in Preserve size, nor any standard on the minimum time that should be committed to each survey. No survey start time is reported. No survey duration is reported. No standards are reported about whether birds overflying the Preserve are counted, or whether animals seen just offsite are recorded, or if they are counted, then to what height above ground or distance from the Preserve's boundary they are counted. The Annual Reports fail to report the most fundamental methodological details that the reader needs to interpret the monitoring results.

The windshield surveys for wildlife have been completed at different types of year from year to year, hence rendering inter-annual survey results incomparable for migratory species. One such migratory species is Swainson's hawk, which has been the most important of the wildlife species covered by the SJMSCP. More than $63 \%$ of the surveys have been completed during times of the year when Swainson's hawks are on migration to Mexico, which means that slightly more than a third of the surveys had any potential for detection of Swainson's hawks. Therefore, I completed my analysis of Swainson's hawk detections by first filtering out the surveys that would not have detected Swainson's hawks while they were on migration.

According to the 2018 Annual Report, "Overall, the Swainson's hawk population in San Joaquin County appears to be doing well, with a relatively high density of nesting pairs
and a high rate of nest success." According to the 2021 Annual Report, "the SJMSCP appears to be highly successful with respect to providing high quality habitat for Swainson's hawk." However, these conclusions were not found on any obvious comparison of performance metrics through time. After filtering the survey results as described above, I found evidence of an ongoing rapid decline of Swainson's hawks among the SJMSCP Preserves (Figure 4). Another performance metric further supports this trend, as I will report below under Focused Surveys. In any case, the aboveconclusions in the 2018 and 2021 Annual Reports are inaccurate and misleading. The SJMSCP has failed to conserve Swainson's hawks, and appears to be contributing to its progress towards extirpation in the County.

Figure 4. The number of Swainson's hawk detections per survey during the months April through September has declined rapidly among Preserves since 2014. A nonlinear regression fit to the data indicates a recent slowing of the declines, but only after detections of the species have reached a very low level.


Not only does the evidence in the Annual Reports support the conclusion that the SJMSCP has failed to conserve Swainson's hawks, but it also supports the conclusions that the SJMSCP is also failing to conserve other covered species (Figure 5). The covered species included in Figure 5 are those also identified in Table 2, as these also have other forms of special status. Additionally, the number of species detections of all vertebrate wildlife has been rapidly declining since 2014 (Figure 6). This decline has been a $42 \%$ loss of vertebrate species richness among the Preserves in only the last seven years. Considering the trends of Swainson's hawk (Figure 4), covered species (Figure 5), and all vertebrate species (Figure 6), declines of these magnitudes are indicative of regional ecological collapse, the ecological, economic, and cultural significance of which are yet to be analyzed, but which are likely to be profound.

Figure 5. The number of covered species detections per survey among Preserves has declined since 2013, according to the data from biological effectiveness monitoring in the Annual Reports.

Figure 6. The number of all species detections per survey among Preserves has declined since 2015, according to the data from biological effectiveness monitoring in the Annual Reports. 2015 was when all species were first routinely recorded from the surveys.



Focused Surveys.--Focused surveys for Swainson's hawks are supposed to be completed every three years, including searches for nest sites within 2 miles of each Preserve. However, the first such survey was not completed until 2007, and another eight years went by before the second survey was completed. The fourth survey was completed in 2021, thus averaging one survey per 5.25 years. The reporting of the survey results has been inconsistent, but more importantly there has yet to be a scientifically sound analysis of the data. There has been no accounting of the increase in cumulative Preserve area in the comparisons of performance metrics such as the number of active nest sites and the number of successful nests. And no comparison has been made of the performance metric, the number of fledglings per successful nest.

The number of nests/100 acres has in fact been dangerously unstable, at one point nearing zero, and most recently again undergoing a rapid decline (Figure 7). At the same time, the number of fledglings per successful nest has steadily declined by $34 \%$ between 2007 and 2021 (Figure 8). At the present rate of decline, Swainson's hawks could be extirpated from San Joaquin County before the end of the SJMSCP's permit term.

Without explanation for the 20-year delay, focused surveys for burrowing owls - the second most important covered species of the SJMSCP - did not begin until 2021. There is obviously no baseline against which to compare the findings of the 2021 survey. In 2021, the focused surveys detected only two pairs of breeding burrowing owls among all of the 16,667 acres of Preserves acquired by the time of the 2021 survey. Failure to adequately complete focused surveys as required by the SJMSCP hampers the ability of managers to react to emerging deficiencies in this nexus.

Study Design and Implementation.-The positive-sighting nature of the reporting complicates the processing and analysis of data, although none of the Annual Reports analyze the data, anyway. A more effective approach would have been to deliberately record o for all species that could potentially occur on a Preserve, but were not detected.

A randomized selection of sampling plots within the SJMSCP study area would have minimized potential bias in trend analysis of both the biological effectiveness monitoring and focused surveys. Instead, the SJMSCP implemented a survey design that grows and changes with the acquisitions and losses of Preserves. In other words, the sample size and the sampled area are always changing, which could change a performance metric positively or negatively for reasons having nothing to do with actual population trends.

Another trend indicative of a problem of implementation is the declining average number of acres monitored per Preserve (Figure 9). This decline reflects a trend towards acquisition of increasingly smaller properties as Preserves since the SJMSCP's inception. I do not know the reason for this trend, but it probably results from a diminishing pool of willing sellers of conservation easements in San Joaquin County. Acquiring smaller properties has likely lessened the probability of inclusion of covered species, which could bias analysis of inter-annual trends in species' detections/survey. More importantly, smaller properties are less capable of conserving covered species.

Figure 7. Focused surveys for Swainson's hawk nest sites within two miles of Preserves have revealed an unstable trend in nests per 100 acres of cumulative Preserves, and a dangerously low density in 2017.


Figure 8. Focused surveys for Swainson's hawk nest sites within two miles of Preserves have revealed a rapid decline in productivity between 2007 and 2021.


Figure 9. The average number of acres monitored among Preserves has declined by year since 2008 .


Finally, although the SJMSCP's monitoring data are fraught with errors and potential biases, they are the data the SJMSCP is supposed to rely upon as evidence of the SJMSCP's performance. The absence of analysis of the data collected to date has prevented administrators of the SJMSCP from seeing (1) problems with study design, (2) problems with the data, (3) mismatches of biological resources between new project sites and Preserves, and (4) the alarming declines of covered species including Swainson's hawks and burrowing owls. Unable to see the impacts of the SJMSCP and the ineffectiveness of its mitigation plan, managers have been unable to react to emerging deficiencies in the nexus sought by the SJMSCP. The SJMSCP has failed in its implementation, and it has proven ineffective at conserving its covered species; it should not be used to mitigate impacts to wildlife that occur on the project site.

## Requirement BIO-2: Recommendations of Biological Resources Analysis Report

Pre-construction Reptile Survey. Contrary to the implication by Olberding (2021), preconstruction surveys for California glossy snake and San Joaquin coachwhip cannot support absence determinations of either species. Preconstruction, take-avoidance surveys are unequal to detection surveys, as they do not carry anywhere close to the same probability of detection. Detection surveys by qualified biologists need to be
completed as part of the CEQA review, and they need to inform preconstruction surveys about where members of the species are likely to be found.

Pre-Construction Avian Survey. Olberding (2021) characterizes the avian breeding season as February through August. However, the avian breeding season recognized by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife is now 1 February through 15 September.

I concur that preconstruction surveys for nesting birds should be implemented. However, having performed nest surveys for many bird species, I can attest to the difficulty of finding nest sites. Birds are highly skilled at hiding their nests, because with the exception of a few species, those birds that fail to hide their nests would fail in their nest attempts due to predation. Loggerhead shrikes and burrowing owls, as examples, make efforts to fool human observers into thinking the birds' nests are located where

- they are not. Locating nest sites of these species and most others requires multiple surveys over long time periods to note behavior patterns that can lead the observer to nest sites. This is why the breeding-season survey protocols require multiple surveys spaced through much of the breeding season, such as for burrowing owls (CDFW 2012). None of the available survey protocols for breeding birds recommend surveys to be completed within only a few days such as prior to construction, and this is because the notion that such a briefly conducted survey would detect more than a small fraction of nest sites is fantasy.

Preconstruction surveys should be performed for nesting birds, but not without first having completed detection surveys to inform where biologists can expect to find nests during their subsequent preconstruction surveys. Preconstruction surveys are only intended as last-minute, one-time salvage and rescue operations targeting readily detectable nests or individuals before they are crushed under heavy construction machinery. Because most special-status species are rare and cryptic, and because most bird species are expert at hiding their nests lest they get predated, most of their nests will not be detected by preconstruction surveys without prior support of detection surveys. For one thing, bird species vary in the timing of their nesting. For example, at a project site that I searched for nest attempts this past February through August, some bird species had already produced fledglings and some species began re-nesting before other bird species began nesting. Locating all of the nests on site would require more effort than is committed during preconstruction surveys. Furthermore, I found cavitynesters to be easiest to locate, and ground-nesters the most difficult.

Regardless of whether construction timing avoids the nesting season or preconstruction surveys are completed, this measure would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels because the project would destroy the productive capacity of the birds that breed on the project site. Neither would the preconstruction surveys do anything to thwart or diminish the impacts of further habitat fragmentation.

Should the project go forward, I recommend that it be required of the preconstruction survey biologists to prepare a report of the methods and outcomes of preconstruction surveys. The report should be made available to the public.

Burrowing Owl Surveys. Contrary to the implication by Olberding (2021), preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls cannot support an absence determination. Preconstruction surveys are supposed to be preceded by protocol-level detection surveys (CDFW 2012). Note, also, that Olberding (2021) cites obsolete survey guidelines for burrowing owls. Furthermore, Olberding's (2021) recommendation for burrow destruction or passive relocation, no matter the behaviors of the associated burrowing owls, can be regarded as take, according to CDFW (2012).

Thank you for your attention,


Shawn Smallwood, Ph.D.
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Swainson's hawk perched on nest site on south side of Dos Reis Road next to the project site, 21 September 2023.

# Kenneth Shawn Smallwood Curriculum Vitae 

3108 Finch Street
Davis, CA 95616
Phone (530) 756-4598
Cell (530) 601-6857
puma@den.org

Born May 3, 1963 in Sacramento, California. Married, father of two.

## Expertise

- Finding solutions to controversial problems related to wildlife interactions with human industry, infrastructure, and activities;
- Wildlife monitoring and field study using GPS, thermal imaging, behavior surveys;
- Using systems analysis and experimental design principles to identify meaningful ecological patterns that inform management decisions.


## Education

Ph.D. Ecology, University of California, Davis. September 1990.
M.S. Ecology, University of California, Davis. June 1987.
B.S. Anthropology, University of California, Davis. June 1985. Corcoran High School, Corcoran, California. June 1981.

## Experience

- $\quad 762$ professional reports, including:
- $\quad 90$ peer reviewed publications
- $\quad 24$ in non-reviewed proceedings
- 646 reports. declarations, posters and book reviews
- 8 in mass media outlets
- $\quad 92$ public presentations of research results

Editing for scientific journals: Guest Editor, Wildlife Society Bulletin, 2012-2013, of invited papers representing international views on the impacts of wind energy on wildlife and how to mitigate the impacts. Associate Editor, Journal of Wildlife Management, March 2004 to 30 June 2007. Editorial Board Member, Environmental Management, 10/1999 to 8/2004. Associate Editor, Biological Conservation, 9/1994 to 9/1995.

Member, Alameda County Scientific Review Committee (SRC), August 2006 to April 2011. The five-member committee investigated causes of bird and bat collisions in the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area, and recommended mitigation and monitoring measures. The SRC reviewed the science underlying the Alameda County Avian Protection Program, and advised
the County on how to reduce wildlife fatalities.
Consulting Ecologist, 2004-2007, California Energy Commission (CEC). Provided consulting services as needed to the CEC on renewable energy impacts, monitoring and research, and produced several reports. Also collaborated with Lawrence-Livermore National Lab on research to understand and reduce wind turbine impacts on wildlife.

Consulting Ecologist, 1999-2013, U.S. Navy. Performed endangered species surveys, hazardous waste site monitoring, and habitat restoration for the endangered San Joaquin kangaroo rat, California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, California clapper rail, western burrowing owl, salt marsh harvest mouse, and other species at Naval Air Station Lemoore; Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Detachment Concord; Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island; National Radio Transmitter Facility, Dixon; and, Naval Outlying Landing Field Imperial Beach.

Part-time Lecturer, 1998-2005, California State University, Sacramento. Instructed Mammalogy, Behavioral Ecology, and Ornithology Lab, Contemporary Environmental Issues, Natural Resources Conservation.

Senior Ecologist, 1999-2005, BioResource Consultants. Designed and implemented research and monitoring studies related to avian fatalities at wind turbines, avian electrocutions on electric distribution poles across California, and avian fatalities at transmission lines.

Chairman, Conservation Affairs Committee, The Wildlife Society--Western Section, 1999-2001. Prepared position statements and led efforts directed toward conservation issues, including travel to Washington, D.C. to lobby Congress for more wildlife conservation funding.

Systems Ecologist, 1995-2000, Institute for Sustainable Development. Headed ISD's program on integrated resources management. Developed indicators of ecological integrity for large areas, using remotely sensed data, local community involvement and GIS.

Associate, 1997-1998, Department of Agronomy and Range Science, University of California, Davis. Worked with Shu Geng and Mingua Zhang on several studies related to wildlife interactions with agriculture and patterns of fertilizer and pesticide residues in groundwater across a large landscape.

Lead Scientist, 1996-1999, National Endangered Species Network. Informed academic scientists and environmental activists about emerging issues regarding the Endangered Species Act and other environmental laws. Testified at public hearings on endangered species issues.

Ecologist, 1997-1998, Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology. Conducted field research to determine the impact of past mercury mining on the status of California red-legged frogs in Santa Clara County, California.

Senior Systems Ecologist, 1994-1995, EIP Associates, Sacramento, California. Provided consulting services in environmental planning, and quantitative assessment of land units for their conservation and restoration opportunities basedon ecological resource requirements of 29 special-status species. Developed ecological indicators for prioritizing areas within Yolo County
to receive mitigation funds for habitat easements and restoration.
Post-Graduate Researcher, 1990-1994, Department of Agronomy and Range Science, U.C. Davis. Under Dr. Shu Geng's mentorship, studied landscape and management effects on temporal and spatial patterns of abundance among pocket gophers and species of Falconiformes and Carnivora in the Sacramento Valley. Managed and analyzed a data base of energy use in California agriculture. Assisted with landscape (GIS) study of groundwater contamination across Tulare County, California.

Work experience in graduate school: Co-taught Conservation Biology with Dr. Christine Schonewald, 1991 \& 1993, UC Davis Graduate Group in Ecology; Reader for Dr. Richard Coss's course on Psychobiology in 1990, UC Davis Department of Psychology; Research Assistant to Dr. Walter E. Howard, 1988-1990, UC Davis Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, testing durable baits for pocket gopher management in forest clearcuts; Research Assistant to Dr. Terrell P. Salmon, 1987-1988, UC Wildlife Extension, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, developing empirical models of mammal and bird invasions in North America, and a rating system for priority research and control of exotic species based on economic, environmental and human health hazards in California. Student Assistant to Dr. E. Lee Fitzhugh, 1985-1987, UC Cooperative Extension, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, developing and implementing statewide mountain lion track count for long-term monitoring.

Fulbright Research Fellow, Indonesia, 1988. Tested use of new sampling methods for numerical monitoring of Sumatran tiger and six other species of endemic felids, and evaluated methods used by other researchers.

## Projects

Repowering wind energy projects through careful siting of new wind turbines using map-based collision hazard models to minimize impacts to volant wildlife. Funded by wind companies (principally NextEra Renewable Energy, Inc.), California Energy Commission and East Bay Regional Park District, I have collaborated with a GIS analyst and managed a crew of five field biologists performing golden eagle behavior surveys and nocturnal surveys on bats and owls. The goal is to quantify flight patterns for development of predictive models to more carefully site new wind turbines in repowering projects. Focused behavior surveys began May 2012 and continue. Collision hazard models have been prepared for seven wind projects, three of which were built. Planning for additional repowering projects is underway.

Test avian safety of new mixer-ejector wind turbine (MEWT). Designed and implemented a beforeafter, control-impact experimental design to test the avian safety of a new, shrouded wind turbine developed by Ogin Inc. (formerly known as FloDesign Wind Turbine Corporation). Supported by a $\$ 718,000$ grant from the California Energy Commission’s Public Interest Energy Research program and a $20 \%$ match share contribution from Ogin, I managed a crew of seven field biologists who performed periodic fatality searches and behavior surveys, carcass detection trials, nocturnal behavior surveys using a thermal camera, and spatial analyses with the collaboration of a GIS analyst. Field work began 1 April 2012 and ended 30 March 2015 without Ogin installing its MEWTs, but we still achieved multiple important scientific advances.

Reduce avian mortality due to wind turbines at Altamont Pass. Studied wildlife impacts caused by 5,400 wind turbines at the world's most notorious wind resource area. Studied how impacts are perceived by monitoring and how they are affected by terrain, wind patterns, food resources, range management practices, wind turbine operations, seasonal patterns, population cycles, infrastructure management such as electric distribution, animal behavior and social interactions.

Reduce avian mortality on electric distribution poles. Directed research toward reducing bird electrocutions on electric distribution poles, 2000-2007. Oversaw 5 founds of fatality searches at 10,000 poles from Orange County to Glenn County, California, and produced two large reports.

Cook et al. v. Rockwell International et al., No. 90-K-181 (D. Colorado). Provided expert testimony on the role of burrowing animals in affecting the fate of buried and surface-deposited radioactive and hazardous chemical wastes at the Rocky Flats Plant, Colorado. Provided expert reports based on four site visits and an extensive document review of burrowing animals. Conducted transect surveys for evidence of burrowing animals and other wildlife on and around waste facilities. Discovered substantial intrusion of waste structures by burrowing animals. I testified in federal court in November 2005, and my clients were subsequently awarded a $\$ 553,000,000$ judgment by a jury. After appeals the award was increased to two billion dollars.

Hanford Nuclear Reservation Litigation. Provided expert testimony on the role of burrowing animals in affecting the fate of buried radioactive wastes at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, Washington. Provided three expert reports based on three site visits and extensive document review. Predicted and verified a certain population density of pocket gophers on buried waste structures, as well as incidence of radionuclide contamination in body tissue. Conducted transect surveys for evidence of burrowing animals and other wildlife on and around waste facilities. Discovered substantial intrusion of waste structures by burrowing animals.

Expert testimony and declarations on proposed residential and commercial developments, gas-fired power plants, wind, solar and geothermal projects, water transfers and water transfer delivery systems, endangered species recovery plans, Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Communities Conservation Programs. Testified before multiple government agencies, Tribunals, Boards of Supervisors and City Councils, and participated with press conferences and depositions. Prepared expert witness reports and court declarations, which are summarized under Reports (below).

Protocol-level surveys for special-status species. Used California Department of Fish and Wildlife and US Fish and Wildlife Service protocols to search for California red-legged frog, California tiger salamander, arroyo southwestern toad, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, western pond turtle, giant kangaroo rat, San Joaquin kangaroo rat, San Joaquin kit fox, western burrowing owl, Swainson’s hawk, Valley elderberry longhorn beetle and other special-status species.

Conservation of San Joaquin kangaroo rat. Performed research to identify factors responsible for the decline of this endangered species at Lemoore Naval Air Station, 2000-2013, and implemented habitat enhancements designed to reverse the trend and expand the population.

Impact of West Nile Virus on yellow-billed magpies. Funded by Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District, 2005-2008, compared survey results pre- and post-West Nile Virus epidemic for multiple bird species in the Sacramento Valley, particularly on yellow-billed magpie and American crow due to susceptibility to WNV.

Workshops on HCPs. Assisted Dr. Michael Morrison with organizing and conducting a 2-day workshop on Habitat Conservation Plans, sponsored by Southern California Edison, and another 1day workshop sponsored by PG\&E. These Workshops were attended by academics, attorneys, and consultants with HCP experience. We guest-edited a Proceedings published in Environmental Management.

Mapping of biological resources along Highways 101, 46 and 41. Used GPS and GIS to delineate vegetation complexes and locations of special-status species along 26 miles of highway in San Luis Obispo County, 14 miles of highway and roadway in Monterey County, and in a large area north of Fresno, including within reclaimed gravel mining pits.

GPS mapping and monitoring at restoration sites and at Caltrans mitigation sites. Monitored the success of elderberry shrubs at one location, the success of willows at another location, and the response of wildlife to the succession of vegetation at both sites. Also used GPS to monitor the response of fossorial animals to yellow star-thistle eradication and natural grassland restoration efforts at Bear Valley in Colusa County and at the decommissioned Mather Air Force Base in Sacramento County.

Mercury effects on Red-legged Frog. Assisted Dr. Michael Morrison and US Fish and Wildlife Service in assessing the possible impacts of historical mercury mining on the federally listed California red-legged frog in Santa Clara County. Also measured habitat variables in streams.

Opposition to proposed No Surprises rule. Wrote a white paper and summary letter explaining scientific grounds for opposing the incidental take permit (ITP) rules providing ITP applicants and holders with general assurances they will be free of compliance with the Endangered Species Act once they adhere to the terms of a "properly functioning HCP." Submitted 188 signatures of scientists and environmental professionals concerned about No Surprises rule US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, all US Senators.

Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan alternative. Designed narrow channel marsh to increase the likelihood of survival and recovery in the wild of giant garter snake, Swainson's hawk and Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. The design included replication and interspersion of treatments for experimental testing of critical habitat elements. I provided a report to Northern Territories, Inc.

Assessments of agricultural production system and environmental technology transfer to China. Twice visited China and interviewed scientists, industrialists, agriculturalists, and the Directors of the Chinese Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Agriculture to assess the need and possible pathways for environmental clean-up technologies and trade opportunities between the US and China.

Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan. Conducted landscape ecology study of Yolo County to spatially prioritize allocation of mitigation efforts to improve ecosystem functionality within the County from the perspective of 29 special-status species of wildlife and plants. Used a hierarchically structured indicators approach to apply principles of landscape and ecosystem ecology, conservation biology, and local values in rating land units. Derived GIS maps to help guide the conservation area design, and then developed implementation strategies.

Mountain lion track count. Developed and conducted a carnivore monitoring program throughout California since 1985. Species counted include mountain lion, bobcat, black bear, coyote, red and gray fox, raccoon, striped skunk, badger, and black-tailed deer. Vegetation and land use are also monitored. Track survey transect was established on dusty, dirt roads within randomly selected quadrats.

Sumatran tiger and other felids. Upon award of Fulbright Research Fellowship, I designed and initiated track counts for seven species of wild cats in Sumatra, including Sumatran tiger, fishing cat, and golden cat. Spent four months on Sumatra and Java in 1988, and learned Bahasa Indonesia, the official Indonesian language.

Wildlife in agriculture. Beginning as post-graduate research, I studied pocket gophers and other wildlife in 40 alfalfa fields throughout the Sacramento Valley, and I surveyed for wildlife along a 200 mile road transect since 1989 with a hiatus of 1996-2004. The data are analyzed using GIS and methods from landscape ecology, and the results published and presented orally to farming groups in California and elsewhere. I also conducted the first study of wildlife in cover crops used on vineyards and orchards.

Agricultural energy use and Tulare County groundwater study. Developed and analyzed a data base of energy use in California agriculture, and collaborated on a landscape (GIS) study of groundwater contamination across Tulare County, California.

Pocket gopher damage in forest clear-cuts. Developed gopher sampling methods and tested various poison baits and baiting regimes in the largest-ever field study of pocket gopher management in forest plantations, involving 68 research plots in 55 clear-cuts among 6 National Forests in northern California.

Risk assessment of exotic species in North America. Developed empirical models of mammal and bird species invasions in North America, as well as a rating system for assigning priority research and control to exotic species in California, based on economic, environmental, and human health hazards.
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## EXHIBIT B

October 4, 2023
Mike Lozeau
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94618
Subject: Comments on the Municipal Code, Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) Phase 2 Update, And Ashley Warehouse Project

Dear Mr. Lozeau,
We have reviewed the August 2023 Environmental Checklist ("Checklist") for the Municipal Code, Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) Phase 2 Update, And Ashley Warehouse Project ("Project") located in the City of Lathrop ("City"). The Project proposes to construct 1,486,607-square-feet ("SF") of mixeduse space, including $1,352,347$-SF of warehouse space, 110,000 -SF of retail space, 24,000 - SF of office space, and 2,046 parking spaces on the 89.82-acre site.

Our review concludes that the Checklist fails to adequately evaluate the Project's health risk impacts. As a result, emissions and health risk impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project may be underestimated and inadequately addressed. A subsequent Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") should be prepared to adequately assess and mitigate the potential health risk impacts that the project may have on the environment.

## Air Quality

Diesel Particulate Matter Emissions Inadequately Evaluated
The Checklist estimates that the maximum incremental cancer risk posed to nearby, existing sensitive receptors as a result of heavy-duty diesel trucks during Project operation would be 7.0 in one million, which would not exceed the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District ("SJVAPCD") significance threshold of 20 in one million (see excerpt below) (p. 44, Table AIR-4).

Table AIR-4: Summary of Maximum Health Risks

| Rask Metric | Maxmum Risk | Signifcance <br> Threshold | Is ThReshold <br> Exceeded? |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential Cancer Risk <br> (70-year exposure) | 7.0 | 20 per million | No |
| Workplace Cancer Risk <br> (40-year exposure) | 1.3 | 20 per million | No |
| Chronic (non-cancer) | $<0.01$ | Hazard index $\geq 1$ | No |
| Acute (non-cancer) | 0 | Hazard index $\geq 1$ | No |

Sources: AERMOD 11.2.0 (Lakes Environmental Software, 2023); and Harp-2 Air Dispersion and Risk Tool
However, the Checklist fails to conduct a construction health risk analysis ("HRA") or discuss the toxic air contaminant ("TAC") emissions associated with Project construction whatsoever. Consequently, the Checklist's evaluation of the Project's potential health risk impacts, as well as the subsequent less-thansignificant impact conclusion, is incorrect for four reasons.

First, the Checklist fails to mention or provide the exposure assumptions for the HRA, such as the age sensitivity factors ("ASF") or fraction of time at home ("FAH") values whatsoever. Until the Checklist substantiates the use of correct exposure assumptions, the HRA may underestimate the cancer risk posed to nearby, existing sensitive receptors because of Project construction. Furthermore, according to the Risk Assessment Guidelines provided by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), the organization responsible for providing guidance on conducting HRAs in California, the Checklist's models should have used the following equation: ${ }^{1}$

## A. Equation 8.2.4 A: RISKinh-res $=$ DOSEair $\times C P F \times A S F \times E D / A T \times F A H$

7. RISK inh-res $=$ Residential inhalation cancer risk
8. DOSEair $=$ Daily inhalation dose ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$-day)
9. CPF $\quad=$ Inhalation cancer potency factor ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}^{- \text {day }^{-1} \text { ) }}$
10.ASF $\quad=$ Age sensitivity factor for a specified age group (unitless)
11.ED $\quad=$ Exposure duration (in years) for a specified age group
12.AT = Averaging time for lifetime cancer risk (years)
10. $\mathrm{FAH} \quad=$ Fraction of time spent at home (unitless)

The Checklist fails to include a dose and risk equation to calculate the Project's construction cancer risks. As such, we cannot verify that the Checklist's HRA is accurate, and the Project's cancer risks may be underestimated.

[^2]Second, by failing to prepare a quantified construction HRA, the Checklist is inconsistent with CEQA's requirement to correlate the increase in emissions that the Project would generate to the adverse impacts on human health caused by those emissions. ${ }^{2}$ This is incorrect, as construction of the proposed Project will produce DPM emissions through the exhaust stacks of construction equipment over the total construction duration. However, the Checklist fails to evaluate the potential Project-generated TACs or indicate the concentrations at which such pollutants would trigger adverse health effects. Without making a reasonable effort to connect the Project's construction-related TAC emissions to the potential health risks posed to nearby receptors, the Checklist is inconsistent with CEQA's requirement to correlate the increase in emissions generated by the Project with the potential adverse impacts on human health.

Third, the State of California Department of Justice recommends that warehouse projects prepare a quantitative HRA pursuant to OEHHA, the organization responsible for providing guidance on conducting HRAs in California, as well as local air district guidelines. ${ }^{3}$ OEHHA released its most recent Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments in February 2015. This guidance document describes the types of projects that warrant the preparation of an HRA. Specifically, OEHHA recommends that all short-term projects lasting at least 2 months assess cancer risks. ${ }^{4}$ Furthermore, according to OEHHA:
"Exposure from projects lasting more than 6 months should be evaluated for the duration of the project. In all cases, for assessing risk to residential receptors, the exposure should be assumed to start in the third trimester to allow for the use of the ASFs (OEHHA, 2009)." ${ }^{5}$

As the Project's anticipated construction duration likely exceeds the 2-month and 6-month requirements set forth by OEHHA, construction of the Project meets the threshold warranting a quantified HRA under OEHHA guidance and should be evaluated for the entire construction period. These recommendations reflect the most recent state health risk policies, and consequently, a subsequent EIR should be prepared to include an analysis of health risk impacts posed to nearby sensitive receptors from Project-generated DPM emissions.

Fourth, while the Checklist includes an HRA evaluating the health risk impacts to nearby, existing receptors as a result of Project operation, the HRA fails to evaluate the combined lifetime cancer risk to nearby, existing receptors as a result of Project construction and operation together. According to OEHHA guidance "the excess cancer risk is calculated separately for each age grouping and then

[^3]summed to yield cancer risk at the receptor location." ${ }^{6}$ However, the Project's HRA fails to sum each age bin to evaluate the total cancer risk over the course of the Project's total construction and operation. This is incorrect, and an updated analysis should quantify the entirety of the Project's construction and operational health risks together and sum them to compare to the SJVAPCD threshold of 20 in one million, as referenced by the Checklist (p. 44, Table AIR-4).

## Disclaimer

SWAPE has received limited discovery regarding this project. Additional information may become available in the future; thus, we retain the right to revise or amend this report when additional information becomes available. Our professional services have been performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable environmental consultants practicing in this or similar localities at the time of service. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the scope of work, work methodologies and protocols, site conditions, analytical testing results, and findings presented. This report reflects efforts which were limited to information that was reasonably accessible at the time of the work, and may contain informational gaps, inconsistencies, or otherwise be incomplete due to the unavailability or uncertainty of information obtained or provided by third parties.

Sincerely,


Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.
$\operatorname{Pan}(R \sin f e(d$
Paul E. Rosenfeld, Ph.D.
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[^4]
## Matthew F. Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg., QSD, QSP

# Geologic and Hydrogeologic Characterization Investigation and Remediation Strategies Litigation Support and Testifying Expert <br> Industrial Stormwater Compliance <br> CEQA Review 

## Education:

M.S. Degree, Geology, California State University Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 1984.
B.A. Degree, Geology, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA, 1982.

## Professional Certifications:

California Professional Geologist
California Certified Hydrogeologist
Qualified SWPPP Developer and Practitioner

## Professional Experience:

Matt has 30 years of experience in environmental policy, contaminant assessment and remediation, stormwater compliance, and CEQA review. He spent nine years with the U.S. EPA in the RCRA and Superfund programs and served as EPA's Senior Science Policy Advisor in the Western Regional Office where he identified emerging threats to groundwater from perchlorate and MTBE. While with EPA, Matt also served as a Senior Hydrogeologist in the oversight of the assessment of seven major military facilities undergoing base closure. He led numerous enforcement actions under provisions of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and directed efforts to improve hydrogeologic characterization and water quality monitoring. For the past 15 years, as a founding partner with SWAPE, Matt has developed extensive client relationships and has managed complex projects that include consultation as an expert witness and a regulatory specialist, and a manager of projects ranging from industrial stormwater compliance to CEQA review of impacts from hazardous waste, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Positions Matt has held include:

- Founding Partner, Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE) (2003 - present);
- Geology Instructor, Golden West College, 2010 - 2104, 2017;
- Senior Environmental Analyst, Komex H2O Science, Inc. (2000-- 2003);
- Executive Director, Orange Coast Watch (2001-2004);
- Senior Science Policy Advisor and Hydrogeologist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (19891998);
- Hydrogeologist, National Park Service, Water Resources Division (1998-2000);
- Adjunct Faculty Member, San Francisco State University, Department of Geosciences (19931998);
- Instructor, College of Marin, Department of Science (1990-1995);
- Geologist, U.S. Forest Service (1986-1998); and
- Geologist, Dames \& Moore (1984-1986).


## Senior Regulatory and Litigation Support Analyst:

With SWAPE, Matt's responsibilities have included:

- Lead analyst and testifying expert in the review of over 300 environmental impact reports and negative declarations since 2003 under CEQA that identify significant issues with regard to hazardous waste, water resources, water quality, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and geologic hazards. Make recommendations for additional mitigation measures to lead agencies at the local and county level to include additional characterization of health risks and implementation of protective measures to reduce worker exposure to hazards from toxins and Valley Fever.
- Stormwater analysis, sampling and best management practice evaluation at more than 100 industrial facilities.
- Expert witness on numerous cases including, for example, perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) contamination of groundwater, MTBE litigation, air toxins at hazards at a school, CERCLA compliance in assessment and remediation, and industrial stormwater contamination.
- Technical assistance and litigation support for vapor intrusion concerns.
- Lead analyst and testifying expert in the review of environmental issues in license applications for large solar power plants before the California Energy Commission.
- Manager of a project to evaluate numerous formerly used military sites in the western U.S.
- Manager of a comprehensive evaluation of potential sources of perchlorate contamination in Southern California drinking water wells.
- Manager and designated expert for litigation support under provisions of Proposition 65 in the review of releases of gasoline to sources drinking water at major refineries and hundreds of gas stations throughout California.

With Komex H2O Science Inc., Matt's duties included the following:

- Senior author of a report on the extent of perchlorate contamination that was used in testimony by the former U.S. EPA Administrator and General Counsel.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of MTBE use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of perchlorate use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in a study that estimates nationwide costs for MTBE remediation and drinking water treatment, results of which were published in newspapers nationwide and in testimony against provisions of an energy bill that would limit liability for oil companies.
- Research to support litigation to restore drinking water supplies that have been contaminated by MTBE in California and New York.
- Expert witness testimony in a case of oil production-related contamination in Mississippi.
- Lead author for a multi-volume remedial investigation report for an operating school in Los Angeles that met strict regulatory requirements and rigorous deadlines.
- Development of strategic approaches for cleanup of contaminated sites in consultation with clients and regulators.


## Executive Director:

As Executive Director with Orange Coast Watch, Matt led efforts to restore water quality at Orange County beaches from multiple sources of contamination including urban runoff and the discharge of wastewater. In reporting to a Board of Directors that included representatives from leading Orange County universities and businesses, Matt prepared issue papers in the areas of treatment and disinfection of wastewater and control of the discharge of grease to sewer systems. Matt actively participated in the development of countywide water quality permits for the control of urban runoff and permits for the discharge of wastewater. Matt worked with other nonprofits to protect and restore water quality, including Surfrider, Natural Resources Defense Council and Orange County CoastKeeper as well as with business institutions including the Orange County Business Council.

## Hydrogeology:

As a Senior Hydrogeologist with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Matt led investigations to characterize and cleanup closing military bases, including Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, Treasure Island Naval Station, Alameda Naval Station, Moffett Field, Mather Army Airfield, and Sacramento Army Depot. Specific activities were as follows:

- Led efforts to model groundwater flow and contaminant transport, ensured adequacy of monitoring networks, and assessed cleanup alternatives for contaminated sediment, soil, and groundwater.
- Initiated a regional program for evaluation of groundwater sampling practices and laboratory analysis at military bases.
- Identified emerging issues, wrote technical guidance, and assisted in policy and regulation development through work on four national U.S. EPA workgroups, including the Superfund Groundwater Technical Forum and the Federal Facilities Forum.

At the request of the State of Hawaii, Matt developed a methodology to determine the vulnerability of groundwater to contamination on the islands of Maui and Oahu. He used analytical models and a GIS to show zones of vulnerability, and the results were adopted and published by the State of Hawaii and County of Maui.

As a hydrogeologist with the EPA Groundwater Protection Section, Matt worked with provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act and NEPA to prevent drinking water contamination. Specific activities included the following:

- Received an EPA Bronze Medal for his contribution to the development of national guidance for the protection of drinking water.
- Managed the Sole Source Aquifer Program and protected the drinking water of two communities through designation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. He prepared geologic reports, conducted
public hearings, and responded to public comments from residents who were very concerned about the impact of designation.
- Reviewed a number of Environmental Impact Statements for planned major developments, including large hazardous and solid waste disposal facilities, mine reclamation, and water transfer.

Matt served as a hydrogeologist with the RCRA Hazardous Waste program. Duties were as follows:

- Supervised the hydrogeologic investigation of hazardous waste sites to determine compliance with Subtitle $C$ requirements.
- Reviewed and wrote "part B" permits for the disposal of hazardous waste.
- Conducted RCRA Corrective Action investigations of waste sites and led inspections that formed the basis for significant enforcement actions that were developed in close coordination with U.S. EPA legal counsel.
- Wrote contract specifications and supervised contractor's investigations of waste sites.

With the National Park Service, Matt directed service-wide investigations of contaminant sources to prevent degradation of water quality, including the following tasks:

- Applied pertinent laws and regulations including CERCLA, RCRA, NEPA, NRDA, and the Clean Water Act to control military, mining, and landfill contaminants.
- Conducted watershed-scale investigations of contaminants at parks, including Yellowstone and Olympic National Park.
- Identified high-levels of perchlorate in soil adjacent to a national park in New Mexico and advised park superintendent on appropriate response actions under CERCLA.
- Served as a Park Service representative on the Interagency Perchlorate Steering Committee, a national workgroup.
- Developed a program to conduct environmental compliance audits of all National Parks while serving on a national workgroup.
- Co-authored two papers on the potential for water contamination from the operation of personal watercraft and snowmobiles, these papers serving as the basis for the development of nationwide policy on the use of these vehicles in National Parks.
- Contributed to the Federal Multi-Agency Source Water Agreement under the Clean Water Action Plan.


## Policy:

Served senior management as the Senior Science Policy Advisor with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9.

## Activities included the following:

- Advised the Regional Administrator and senior management on emerging issues such as the potential for the gasoline additive MTBE and ammonium perchlorate to contaminate drinking water supplies.
- Shaped EPA's national response to these threats by serving on workgroups and by contributing to guidance, including the Office of Research and Development publication, Oxygenates in Water: Critical Information and Research Needs.
- Improved the technical training of EPA's scientific and engineering staff.
- Earned an EPA Bronze Medal for representing the region's 300 scientists and engineers in negotiations with the Administrator and senior management to better integrate scientific
principles into the policy-making process.
- Established national protocol for the peer review of scientific documents.


## Geology:

With the U.S. Forest Service, Matt led investigations to determine hillslope stability of areas proposed for timber harvest in the central Oregon Coast Range. Specific activities were as follows:

- Mapped geology in the field, and used aerial photographic interpretation and mathematical models to determine slope stability.
- Coordinated his research with community members who were concerned with natural resource protection.
- Characterized the geology of an aquifer that serves as the sole source of drinking water for the city of Medford, Oregon.

As a consultant with Dames and Moore, Matt led geologic investigations of two contaminated sites (later listed on the Superfund NPL) in the Portland, Oregon, area and a large hazardous waste site in eastern Oregon. Duties included the following:

- Supervised year-long effort for soil and groundwater sampling.
- Conducted aquifer tests.
- Investigated active faults beneath sites proposed for hazardous waste disposal.


## Teaching:

From 1990 to 1998, Matt taught at least one course per semester at the community college and university levels:

- At San Francisco State University, held an adjunct faculty position and taught courses in environmental geology, oceanography (lab and lecture), hydrogeology, and groundwater contamination.
- Served as a committee member for graduate and undergraduate students.
- Taught courses in environmental geology and oceanography at the College of Marin.

Matt is currently a part time geology instructor at Golden West College in Huntington Beach, California where he taught from 2010 to 2014 and in 2017.

## Invited Testimony, Reports, Papers and Presentations:

Hagemann, M.F., 2008. Disclosure of Hazardous Waste Issues under CEQA. Presentation to the Public Environmental Law Conference, Eugene, Oregon.

Hagemann, M.F., 2008. Disclosure of Hazardous Waste Issues under CEQA. Invited presentation to U.S. EPA Region 9, San Francisco, California.

Hagemann, M.F., 2005. Use of Electronic Databases in Environmental Regulation, Policy Making and Public Participation. Brownfields 2005, Denver, Coloradao.

Hagemann, M.F., 2004. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Water in Nevada and the Southwestern U.S. Presentation to a meeting of the American Groundwater Trust, Las Vegas, NV (served on conference organizing committee).

Hagemann, M.F., 2004. Invited testimony to a California Senate committee hearing on air toxins at schools in Southern California, Los Angeles.

Brown, A., Farrow, J., Gray, A. and Hagemann, M., 2004. An Estimate of Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Underground Storage Tanks and the Resulting Impact to Drinking Water Wells. Presentation to the Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference, National Groundwater Association.

Hagemann, M.F., 2004. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Water in Arizona and the Southwestern U.S. Presentation to a meeting of the American Groundwater Trust, Phoenix, AZ (served on conference organizing committee).

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Water in the Southwestern U.S. Invited presentation to a special committee meeting of the National Academy of Sciences, Irvine, CA.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Invited presentation to a tribal EPA meeting, Pechanga, CA.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Invited presentation to a meeting of tribal repesentatives, Parker, AZ.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Impact of Perchlorate on the Colorado River and Associated Drinking Water Supplies. Invited presentation to the Inter-Tribal Meeting, Torres Martinez Tribe.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. The Emergence of Perchlorate as a Widespread Drinking Water Contaminant. Invited presentation to the U.S. EPA Region 9.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. A Deductive Approach to the Assessment of Perchlorate Contamination. Invited presentation to the California Assembly Natural Resources Committee.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Perchlorate: A Cold War Legacy in Drinking Water. Presentation to a meeting of the National Groundwater Association.

Hagemann, M.F., 2002. From Tank to Tap: A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater. Presentation to a meeting of the National Groundwater Association.

Hagemann, M.F., 2002. A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater and an Estimate of Costs to Address Impacts to Groundwater. Presentation to the annual meeting of the Society of Environmental Journalists.

Hagemann, M.F., 2002. An Estimate of the Cost to Address MTBE Contamination in Groundwater (and Who Will Pay). Presentation to a meeting of the National Groundwater Association.

Hagemann, M.F., 2002. An Estimate of Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Underground Storage Tanks and the Resulting Impact to Drinking Water Wells. Presentation to a meeting of the U.S. EPA and State Underground Storage Tank Program managers.

Hagemann, M.F., 2001. From Tank to Tap: A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater. Unpublished report.

Hagemann, M.F., 2001. Estimated Cleanup Cost for MTBE in Groundwater Used as Drinking Water. Unpublished report.

Hagemann, M.F., 2001. Estimated Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Leaking Underground Storage Tanks. Unpublished report.

Hagemann, M.F., and VanMouwerik, M., 1999. Potential W ater Quality Concerns Related to Snowmobile Usage. Water Resources Division, National Park Service, Technical Report.

VanMouwerik, M. and Hagemann, M.F. 1999, Water Quality Concerns Related to Personal Watercraft Usage. Water Resources Division, National Park Service, Technical Report.

Hagemann, M.F., 1999, Is Dilution the Solution to Pollution in National Parks? The George Wright Society Biannual Meeting, Asheville, North Carolina.

Hagemann, M.F., 1997, The Potential for MTBE to Contaminate Groundwater. U.S. EPA Superfund Groundwater Technical Forum Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Hagemann, M.F., and Gill, M., 1996, Impediments to Intrinsic Remediation, Moffett Field Naval Air Station, Conference on Intrinsic Remediation of Chlorinated Hydrocarbons, Salt Lake City.

Hagemann, M.F., Fukunaga, G.L., 1996, The Vulnerability of Groundwater to Anthropogenic Contaminants on the Island of Maui, Hawaii. Hawaii Water Works Association Annual Meeting, Maui, October 1996.

Hagemann, M. F., Fukanaga, G. L., 1996, Ranking Groundwater Vulnerability in Central Oahu, Hawaii. Proceedings, Geographic Information Systems in Environmental Resources Management, Air and Waste Management Association Publication VIP-61.

Hagemann, M.F., 1994. Groundwater Characterization and Cleanup at Closing Military Bases in California. Proceedings, California Groundwater Resources Association Meeting.

Hagemann, M.F. and Sabol, M.A., 1993. Role of the U.S. EPA in the High Plains States Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Program. Proceedings, Sixth Biennial Symposium on the Artificial Recharge of Groundwater.

Hagemann, M.F., 1993. U.S. EPA Policy on the Technical Impracticability of the Cleanup of DNAPLcontaminated Groundwater. California Groundwater Resources Association Meeting.

Hagemann, M.F., 1992. Dense Nonaqueous Phase Liquid Contamination of Groundwater: An Ounce of Prevention... Proceedings, Association of Engineering Geologists Annual Meeting, v. 35.

## Other Experience:

Selected as subject matter expert for the California Professional Geologist licensing examinations, 2009-2011.

# Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. 

Chemical Fate and Transport \& Air Dispersion Modeling
Principal Environmental Chemist
Risk Assessment \& Remediation Specialist

## Education

Ph.D. Soil Chemistry, University of Washington, 1999. Dissertation on volatile organic compound filtration.
M.S. Environmental Science, U.C. Berkeley, 1995. Thesis on organic waste economics.
B.A. Environmental Studies, U.C. Santa Barbara, 1991. Focus on wastewater treatment.

## Professional Experience

Dr. Rosenfeld has over 25 years of experience conducting environmental investigations and risk assessments for evaluating impacts to human health, property, and ecological receptors. His expertise focuses on the fate and transport of environmental contaminants, human health risk, exposure assessment, and ecological restoration. Dr. Rosenfeld has evaluated and modeled emissions from oil spills, landfills, boilers and incinerators, process stacks, storage tanks, confined animal feeding operations, industrial, military and agricultural sources, unconventional oil drilling operations, and locomotive and construction engines. His project experience ranges from monitoring and modeling of pollution sources to evaluating impacts of pollution on workers at industrial facilities and residents in surrounding communities. Dr. Rosenfeld has also successfully modeled exposure to contaminants distributed by water systems and via vapor intrusion.

Dr. Rosenfeld has investigated and designed remediation programs and risk assessments for contaminated sites containing lead, heavy metals, mold, bacteria, particulate matter, petroleum hydrocarbons, chlorinated solvents, pesticides, radioactive waste, dioxins and furans, semi- and volatile organic compounds, PCBs, PAHs, creosote, perchlorate, asbestos, per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFOA/PFOS), unusual polymers, fuel oxygenates (MTBE), among other pollutants. Dr. Rosenfeld also has experience evaluating greenhouse gas emissions from various projects and is an expert on the assessment of odors from industrial and agricultural sites, as well as the evaluation of odor nuisance impacts and technologies for abatement of odorous emissions. As a principal scientist at SWAPE, Dr. Rosenfeld directs air dispersion modeling and exposure assessments. He has served as an expert witness and testified about pollution sources causing nuisance and/or personal injury at sites and has testified as an expert witness on numerous cases involving exposure to soil, water and air contaminants from industrial, railroad, agricultural, and military sources.

## Professional History:

Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE); 2003 to present; Principal and Founding Partner
UCLA School of Public Health; 2007 to 2011; Lecturer (Assistant Researcher)
UCLA School of Public Health; 2003 to 2006; Adjunct Professor
UCLA Environmental Science and Engineering Program; 2002-2004; Doctoral Intern Coordinator
UCLA Institute of the Environment, 2001-2002; Research Associate
Komex $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ Science, 200 I to 2003; Senior Remediation Scientist
National Groundwater Association, 2002-2004; Lecturer
San Diego State University, 1999-2001; Adjunct Professor
Anteon Corp., San Diego, 2000-2001; Remediation Project Manager
Ogden (now Amec), San Diego, 2000-2000; Remediation Project Manager
Bechtel, San Diego, California, 1999-2000; Risk Assessor
King County, Seattle, 1996-1999; Scientist
James River Corp., Washington, 1995-96; Scientist
Big Creek Lumber, Davenport, California, 1995; Scientist
Plumas Corp., California and USFS, Tahoe 1993-I995; Scientist
Peace Corps and World Wildlife Fund, St. Kitts, West Indies, 1991-1993; Scientist

## Publications:

Rosenfeld P. E., Spaeth K., Hallman R., Bressler R., Smith, G., (2022) Cancer Risk and Diesel Exhaust Exposure Among Railroad Workers. Water Air Soil Pollution. 233, 171.

Remy, L.L., Clay T., Byers, V., Rosenfeld P. E. (2019) Hospital, Health, and Community Burden After Oil Refinery Fires, Richmond, California 2007 and 2012. Environmental Health. 18:48

Simons, R.A., Seo, Y. Rosenfeld, P., (2015) Modeling the Effect of Refinery Emission On Residential Property Value. Journal of Real Estate Research. 27(3):321-342

Chen, J. A, Zapata A. R., Sutherland A. J., Molmen, D.R., Chow, B. S., Wu, L. E., Rosenfeld, P. E., Hesse, R. C., (2012) Sulfur Dioxide and Volatile Organic Compound Exposure To A Community In Texas City Texas Evaluated Using Aermod and Empirical Data. American Journal of Environmental Science, 8(6), 622-632.

Rosenfeld, P.E. \& Feng, L. (2011). The Risks of Hazardous Waste. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.
Cheremisinoff, N.P., \& Rosenfeld, P.E. (2011). Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Agrochemical Industry, Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Gonzalez, J., Feng, L., Sutherland, A., Waller, C., Sok, H., Hesse, R., Rosenfeld, P. (2010). PCBs and Dioxins/Furans in Attic Dust Collected Near Former PCB Production and Secondary Copper Facilities in Sauget, IL. Procedia Environmental Sciences. 113-125.

Feng, L., Wu, C., Tam, L., Sutherland, A.J., Clark, J.J., Rosenfeld, P.E. (2010). Dioxin and Furan Blood Lipid and Attic Dust Concentrations in Populations Living Near Four Wood Treatment Facilities in the United States. Journal of Environmental Health. 73(6), 34-46.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., \& Rosenfeld, P.E. (2010). Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Wood and Paper Industries. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., \& Rosenfeld, P.E. (2009). Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Petroleum Industry. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., Rosenfeld, P. (2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment, Air Pollution, 123 (17), 319-327.

Tam L. K.., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and Rosenfeld, P.E. (2008). A Statistical Analysis Of Attic Dust And Blood Lipid Concentrations Of Tetrachloro-p-Dibenzodioxin (TCDD) Toxicity Equivalency Quotients (TEQ) In Two Populations Near Wood Treatment Facilities. Organohalogen Compounds, 70, 002252-002255.

Tam L. K.., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and Rosenfeld, P.E. (2008). Methods For Collect Samples For Assessing Dioxins And Other Environmental Contaminants In Attic Dust: A Review. Organohalogen Compounds, 70, 000527000530 .

Hensley, A.R. A. Scott, J. J. J. Clark, Rosenfeld, P.E. (2007). Attic Dust and Human Blood Samples Collected near a Former Wood Treatment Facility. Environmental Research. 105, 194-197.

Rosenfeld, P.E., J. J. J. Clark, A. R. Hensley, M. Suffet. (2007). The Use of an Odor Wheel Classification for Evaluation of Human Health Risk Criteria for Compost Facilities. Water Science \& Technology 55(5), 345-357.

Rosenfeld, P. E., M. Suffet. (2007). The Anatomy Of Odour Wheels For Odours Of Drinking Water, Wastewater, Compost And The Urban Environment. Water Science \& Technology 55(5), 335-344.

Sullivan, P. J. Clark, J.J.J., Agardy, F. J., Rosenfeld, P.E. (2007). Toxic Legacy, Synthetic Toxins in the Food, Water, and Air in American Cities. Boston Massachusetts: Elsevier Publishing

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash. Hater Science and Technology. 49(9), 171-178.

Rosenfeld P. E., J.J. Clark, I.H. (Mel) Suffet (2004). The Value of An Odor-Quality-Wheel Classification Scheme For The Urban Environment. Water Environment Federation's Technical Exhibition and Conference (WEFTEC) 2004. New Orleans, October 2-6, 2004.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Suffet, 1.H. (2004). Understanding Odorants Associated With Compost, Biomass Facilities, and the Land Application of Biosolids. Water Science and Technology. 49(9), 193-199.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash, Water Science and Technology, 49(9), 171-178.

Rosenfeld, P. E., Grey, M. A., Sellew, P. (2004). Measurement of Biosolids Odor and Odorant Emissions from Windrows, Static Pile and Biofilter. Water Environment Research. 76(4), 310-315.

Rosenfeld, P.E., Grey, M and Suffet, M. (2002). Compost Demonstration Project, Sacramento California Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. Integrated Waste Management Board Public Affairs Office, Publications Clearinghouse (MS-6), Sacramento, CA Publication \#442-02-008.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and C.L. Henry. (2001). Characterization of odor emissions from three different biosolids. Water Soil and Air Pollution. 127(1-4), 173-191.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Henry C. L., (2000). Wood ash control of odor emissions from biosolids application. Journal of Environmental Quality. 29, 1662-1668.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry and D. Bennett. (2001). Wastewater dewatering polymer affect on biosolids odor emissions and microbial activity. Water Environment Research. 73(4). 363-367.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and C.L. Henry. (2001). Activated Carbon and Wood Ash Sorption of Wastewater, Compost, and Biosolids Odorants. Water Environment Research, 73, 388-393.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Henry C. L., (2001). High carbon wood ash effect on biosolids microbial activity and odor. Water Environment Research. 131(1-4), 247-262.

Chollack, T. and P. Rosenfeld. (1998). Compost Amendment Handbook For Landscaping. Prepared for and distributed by the City of Redmond, Washington State.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1992). The Mount Liamuiga Crater Trail. Heritage Magazine of St. Kitts, 3(2).
Rosenfeld, P. E. (1993). High School Biogas Project to Prevent Deforestation On St. Kitts. Biomass U/sers Network, 7(1).

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions From Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. Doctoral Thesis. University of Washington College of Forest Resources.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1994). Potential Utilization of Small Diameter Trees on Sierra County Public Land. Masters thesis reprinted by the Sierra County Economic Council. Sierra County, California.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1991). How to Build a Small Rural Anaerobic Digester \& Uses Of Biogas In The First And Third World. Bachelors Thesis. University of California.

## Presentations:

Rosenfeld, P.E., "The science for Perfluorinated Chemicals (PFAS): What makes remediation so hard?" Law Seminars International, (May 9-10, 2018) 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 101 Seattle, WA.

Rosenfeld, P.E., Sutherland, A; Hesse, R.: Zapata, A. (October 3-6, 2013). Air dispersion modeling of volatile organic emissions from multiple natural gas wells in Decatur, TX. t4th Western Regional Meeting, American Chemical Society. Lecture conducted from Santa Clara, CA.

Sok, H.L.; Waller, C.C.; Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sutherland. A.J.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; Hesse, R.C.; Rosenfeld, P.E. (June 20-23, 2010). Atrazine: A Persistent Pesticide in Urban Drinking Water. Urban Environmental Pollution. Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sok, H.L.; Sutherland, A.J.; Waller, C.C.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; La, M.; Hesse, R.C.; Rosenfeld, P.E. (June 20-23, 2010). Bringing Environmental Justice to East St. Louis, lllinois. Urban Environmental Pollution. Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

Rosenfeld, P.E. (April 19-23, 2009). Perfluoroctanoic Acid (PFOA) and Perfluoroactane Sulfonate (PFOS) Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. 2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting, Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

Rosenfeld, P.E. (April 19-23, 2009). Cost to Filter Atrazine Contamination from Drinking Water in the United States" Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. 2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting. Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., Rosenfeld, P. (20-22 July, 2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. Brebbia, C.A. and Popov, V., eds., Air Pollution XITI: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Modeling, Monitoring and Management of Air Pollution. Lecture conducted from Tallinn, Estonia.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (October 15-18, 2007). Moss Point Community Exposure To Contaminants From A Releasing Facility. The $23^{\text {rd }}$ Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water. Platform lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (October 15-18, 2007). The Repeated Trespass of Tritium-Contaminated Water Into A Surrounding Community Form Repeated Waste Spills From A Nuclear Power Plant. The $23^{r d}$ Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water. Platform lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (October 15-18, 2007). Somerville Community Exposure To Contaminants From Wood Treatment Facility Emissions. The $23^{r d}$ Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water. Lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

Rosenfeld P. E. (March 2007). Production, Chemical Properties, Toxicology, \& Treatment Case Studies of 1,2,3Trichloropropane (TCP). The Association for Environmental Health and Sciences (AEHS) Annual Meeting. Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

Rosenfeld P. E. (March 2007). Blood and Attic Sampling for Dioxin/Furan, PAH, and Metal Exposure in Florala, Alabama. The AEIIS Anmial Meeting. Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., Rosenfeld P.E., Clark, J.J.J. (August $21-25,2006$ ). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. The 26 th International Symposium on IIalogenated Persistent Organic Polhutants - DIOXIN2006. Lecture conducted from Radisson SAS Scandinavia Hotel in Oslo Norway.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., Rosenfeld P.E., Clark, J.J.J. (November 4-8, 2006). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. APHA 134 Annual Meeting \& Exposition. Lecture conducted from Boston Massachusetts.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (October 24-25, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. Mealey's C8/PFOA. Science, Risk \& Litigation Conference. Lecture conducted from The Rittenhouse Hotel, Philadelphia, PA.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (September 19, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, Toxicology' and Remediation PEMIA Emerging Contaminant Conference. Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel, Irvine California.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (September 19, 2005). Fate, Transport, Toxicity, And Persistence of 1,2,3-TCP. PENLA Emerging Contaminant Conference. Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel in Irvine, California.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (September 26-27, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PDBEs. Mealey's Groundwater Conference. Lecture conducted from Ritz Carlton Hotel, Marina Del Ray, California.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (June 7-8, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. International Society of Environmental Forensics: Focus On Emerging Contaminants. Lecture conducted from Sheraton Oceanfront Hotel, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (July 21-22. 2005). Fate Transport, Persistence and Toxicology of PFOA and Related Perfluorochemicals. 2005 National Grouncwater Association Ground Water And Environmental Law Conference. Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (July 21-22, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, Toxicology and Remediation. 2005 National Grounctuvater Association Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference. Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. and James Clark Ph.D. and Rob Hesse R.G. (May 5-6, 2004). Tert-butyl Alcohol Liability and Toxicology, A National Problem and Unquantified Liability. National Grounctrater Association. Environmental Law Conference. Lecture conducted from Congress Plaza Hotel, Chicago Illinois.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. (March 2004). Perchlorate Toxicology. Meeting of the American Grounchuater Trust. Lecture conducted from Phoenix Arizona.

Hagemann, M.F., Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. and Rob Hesse (2004). Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Meeting of tribal representatives. Lecture conducted from Parker, AZ.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. (April 7, 2004). A National Damage Assessment Model For PCE and Dry Cleaners. Drycleaner Symposium. California Ground Water Association. Lecture conducted from Radison Hotel, Sacramento, California.

Rosenfeld, P. E., Grey, M., (June 2003) Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. Seventh International In Situ And On Site Bioremediation Symposium Battelle Conference Orlando, FL.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. and James Clark Ph.D. (February 20-21, 2003) Understanding Historical Use, Chemical Properties, Toxicity and Regulatory Guidance of 1,4 Dioxane. National Grouncwater Association. Southwest Focus Conference. Water Supply and Emerging Contaminants.. Lecture conducted from Hyatt Regency Phoenix Arizona.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. (February 6-7, 2003). Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. California CUPA Forum. Lecture conducted from Marriott Hotel, Anaheim California.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. (October 23, 2002) Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. EPA Underground Storage Tank Roundtable. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

Rosenfeld, P.E. and Suffet, M. (October 7- 10, 2002). Understanding Odor from Compost, Wastewater and Industrial Processes. Sixth Annual Symposium On Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association. Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

Rosenfeld, P.E. and Suffet, M. (October 7-10, 2002). Using High Carbon Wood Ash to Control Compost Odor. Sixth Annual Symposium On Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association. Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

Rosenfeld, P.E. and Grey, M. A. (September 22-24, 2002). Biocycle Composting For Coastal Sage Restoration. Northwest Biosolids Management Association. Lecture conducted from Vancouver Washington..

Rosenfeld, P.E. and Grey, M. A. (November 11-14, 2002). Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. Soil Science Society Annual Conference. Lecture conducted from Indianapolis, Maryland.

Rosenfeld. P.E. (September 16, 2000). Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. Water Environment Federation. Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

Rosenfeld. P.E. (October 16, 2000). Wood ash and biofilter control of compost odor. Biofest. Lecture conducted from Ocean Shores, California.

Rosenfeld, P.E. (2000). Bioremediation Using Organic Soil Amendments. California Resource Recovery Association. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation With High-Carbon Wood-Ash. Water Environment Federation I2th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and C.L. Henry. (1999). An evaluation of ash incorporation with biosolids for odor reduction. Soil Science Society of America. Lecture conducted from Salt Lake City Utah.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Comparison of Microbial Activity and Odor Emissions from Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. Brown and Caldwell. Lecture conducted from Seattle Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry. (1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions from Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. Biofest. Lecture conducted from Lake Chelan, Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E, C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation With High-Carbon Wood-Ash. Water Environment Federation 12th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry, R. B. Harrison, and R. Dills. (1997). Comparison of Odor Emissions From Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. Soil Science Society of America. Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

## Teaching Experience:

UCLA Department of Environmental Health (Summer 2003 through 20010) Taught Environmental Health Science 100 to students, including undergrad, medical doctors, public health professionals and nurses. Course focused on the health effects of environmental contaminants.

National Ground Water Association, Successful Remediation Technologies. Custom Course in Sante Fe, New Mexico. May 21, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of fuel contaminants associated with underground storage tanks.

National Ground Water Association; Successful Remediation Technologies Course in Chicago Illinois. April 1, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of contaminants associated with Superfund and RCRA sites.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, April and May, 2001. Alternative Landfill Caps Seminar in San Diego, Ventura, and San Francisco. Focused on both prescriptive and innovative landfill cover design.

UCLA Department of Environmental Engineering, February 5, 2002. Seminar on Successful Remediation Technologies focusing on Groundwater Remediation.

University Of Washington, Soil Science Program, Teaching Assistant for several courses including: Soil Chemistry, Organic Soil Amendments, and Soil Stability.
U.C. Berkeley, Environmental Science Program Teaching Assistant for Environmental Science 10.

## Academic Grants Awarded:

California Integrated Waste Management Board. $\$ 41,000$ grant awarded to UCLA Institute of the Environment. Goal: To investigate effect of high carbon wood ash on volatile organic emissions from compost. 200 I.

Synagro Technologies, Corona California: \$I0,000 grant awarded to San Diego State University.
Goal: investigate effect of biosolids for restoration and remediation of degraded coastal sage soils. 2000.
King County, Department of Research and Technology, Washington State. $\$ 100,000$ grant awarded to University of Washington: Goal: To investigate odor emissions from biosolids application and the effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions. 1998.

Northwest Biosolids Management Association, Washington State. $\$ 20,000$ grant awarded to investigate effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions from biosolids. 1997.

James River Corporation, Oregon: $\$ 10,000$ grant was awarded to investigate the success of genetically engineered Poplar trees with resistance to round-up. 1996.

United State Forest Service, Tahoe National Forest: $\$ 15,000$ grant was awarded to investigating fire ecology of the Tahoe National Forest. 1995.

Kellogg Foundation, Washington D.C. $\$ 500$ grant was awarded to construct a large anaerobic digester on St. Kitts in West Indies. 1993

## Deposition and/or Trial Testimony:

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino
Billy Wildrick, Plaintiff vs. BNSF Railway Company
Case No. CIVDS1711810
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-17-2022
In the State Court of Bibb County, State of Georgia
Richard Hutcherson, Plaintiff vs Norfolk Southern Railway Company
Case No. 10-SCCV-092007
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-6-2022
In the Civil District Court of the Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana
Millard Clark, Plaintiff vs. Dixie Carriers, Inc. et al.
Case No. 2020-03891
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-15-2022
In The Circuit Court of Livingston County, State of Missouri, Circuit Civil Division Shirley Ralls, Plaintiff vs. Canadian Pacific Railway and Soo Line Railroad
Case No. 18-LV-CC0020
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-7-2022
In The Circuit Court of the 13th Judicial Circuit Court, Hillsborough County, Florida Civil Division
Jonny C. Daniels, Plaintiff vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No. 20-CA-5502
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-1-2022
In The Circuit Court of St. Louis County, State of Missouri
Kieth Luke et. al. Plaintiff vs. Monsanto Company et. al.
Case No. 19SL-CC03191
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-25-2022
In The Circuit Court of the 13th Judicial Circuit Court, Hillsborough County, Florida Civil Division
Jeffery S. Lamotte, Plaintiff vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No. NO. 20-CA-0049
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-22-2022
In State of Minnesota District Court, County of St. Louis Sixth Judicial District
Greg Bean, Plaintiff vs. Soo Line Railroad Company
Case No. 69-DU-CV-21-760
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-17-2022
In United States District Court Western District of Washington at Tacoma, Washington
John D. Fitzgerald Plaintiff vs. BNSF
Case No. 3:21-cv-05288-RJB
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-11-2022
In Circuit Court of the Sixth Judicial Circuit, Macon Illinois
Rocky Bennyhoff Plaintiff vs. Norfolk Southern
Case No. 20-L-56
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-3-2022
In Court of Common Pleas, Hamilton County Ohio
Joe Briggins Plaintiff vs. CSX
Case No. A2004464
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-17-2022
In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern
George LaFazia vs. BNSF Railway Company.
Case No. BCV-19-103087
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-17-2022
In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Bobby Earles vs. Penn Central et. al.
Case No. 2020-L-000550
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-16-2022
In United States District Court Easter District of Florida
Albert Hartman Plaintiff vs. Illinois Central
Case No. 2:20-cv-1633
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-4-2022
In the Circuit Court of the $4^{\text {th }}$ Judicial Circuit, in and For Duval County, Florida
Barbara Steele vs. CSX Transportation
Case No.I6-219-Ca-008796
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-15-2022
In United States District Court Easter District of New York
Romano et al. vs. Northrup Grumman Corporation
Case No. $16-\mathrm{cv}-5760$
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-10-2022
In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Linda Benjamin vs. Illinois Central
Case No. No. 2019 L 007599
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-26-2022
In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Donald Smith vs. Illinois Central
Case No. No. 2019 L 003426
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-24-2022
In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Jan Holeman vs. BNSF
Case No. 2019 L 000675
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-18-2022
In the State Court of Bibb County State of Georgia
Dwayne B. Garrett vs. Norfolk Southern
Case No. 20-SCCV-091232
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-10-2021
In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Joseph Ruepke vs. BNSF
Case No. 2019 L 007730
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-5-2021
In the United States District Court For the District of Nebraska
Steven Gillett vs. BNSF
Case No. 4:20-cv-03120
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-28-2021
In the Montana Thirteenth District Court of Yellowstone County
James Eadus vs. Soo Line Railroad and BNSF
Case No. DV 19-1056
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-21-2021
In the Circuit Court Of The Twentieth Judicial Circuit, St Clair County, Illinois
Martha Custer et al.cvs. Cerro Flow Products, Inc.
Case No. 0i9-L-2295
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-14-2021
Trial October 8-4-2021
In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Joseph Rafferty vs. Consolidated Rail Corporation and National Railroad Passenger Corporation d/b/a
AMTRAK,
Case No. 18-L-6845
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-28-2021
In the United States District Court For the Northern District of Illinois
Theresa Romcoe vs. Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Railroad Corporation d/b/a METRA RailCase No. 17-cv-8517
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-25-2021
In the Superior Court of the State of Arizona In and For the Cunty of Maricopa
Mary Tryon et al. vs. The City of Pheonix v. Cox Cactus Farm, L.L.C., Utah Shelter Systems, Inc.
Case No. CV20127-094749
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-7-2021
In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas Beaumont Division
Robinson, Jeremy et al vs. CNA Insurance Company et al.
Case No. 1:17-cv-000508
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-25-2021
In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino
Gary Garner, Personal Representative for the Estate of Melvin Garner vs. BNSF Railway Company.Case No. 1720288
Rosenfeld Deposition 2-23-2021
In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, Spring Street Courthouse Benny M Rodriguez vs. Union Pacific Railroad, A Corporation, et al.
Case No. 18STCV01162
Rosenfeld Deposition 12-23-2020
In the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri
Karen Cornwell, Plaintiff, vs. Marathon Petroleum, LP, Defendant.
Case No. 1716-CV10006
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-30-2019

In the United States District Court For The District of New Jersey
Duarte et al, Plaintiffs, vs. United States Metals Refining Company et. al. Defendant.
Case No. 2:17-cv-01624-ES-SCM
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-7-2019
In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division
M/T Carla Maersk vs. Conti 168., Schiffahrts-GMBH \& Co. Bulker KG MS "Conti Perdido" Defendant. Case No. 3:15-CV-00106 consolidated with 3:15-CV-00237
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-9-2019
In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles - Santa Monica Carole-Taddeo-Bates et al., vs. Ifran Khan et al., Defendants Case No. BC615636
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-26-2019
In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles - Santa Monica The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments et al. vs El Adobe Apts. Inc. et al., Defendants Case No. BC646857 Rosenfeld Deposition 10-6-2018; Trial 3-7-19

In United States District Court For The District of Colorado Bells et al. Plaintiffs vs. The 3M Company et al., Defendants Case No. 1:16-cv-02531-RBJ Rosenfeld Deposition 3-15-20I8 and 4-3-2018

In The District Court Of Regan County, Texas, $112^{\text {th }}$ Judicial District Phillip Bales et al., Plaintiff vs. Dow Agrosciences, LLC, et al., Defendants Cause No. 1923
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-17-2017
In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Contra Costa Simons et al., Plaintifs vs. Chevron Corporation, et al., Defendants Cause No. CI2-01481
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-20-2017
In The Circuit Court Of The Twentieth Judicial Circuit, St Clair County, Illinois Martha Custer et al., Plaintiff vs. Cerro Flow Products, Inc., Defendants Case No.: No. 0i9-L-2295
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-23-2017
In United States District Court For The Southern District of Mississippi
Guy Manuel vs. The BP Exploration et al., Defendants
Case No. 1:19-cv-00315-RHW
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-22-2020
In The Superior Court of the State of California, For The County of Los Angeles Warrn Gilbert and Penny Gilber, Plaintiff vs. BMW of North America LLC
Case No. LC102019 (c/w BC582154)
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-16-2017, Trail 8-28-2018
In the Northern District Court of Mississippi, Greenville Division
Brenda J. Cooper, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Meritor Inc., et al., Defendants
Case No. 4:16-cv-52-DMB-JVM
Rosenfeld Deposition July 2017

In The Superior Court of the State of Washington, County of Snohomish Michael Davis and Julie Davis et al., Plaintiff vs. Cedar Grove Composting Inc., Defendants Case No. 13-2-03987-5
Rosenfeld Deposition, February 2017
Trial March 2017
In The Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda
Charles Spain., Plaintiff vs. Thermo Fisher Scientific, et al., Defendants
Case No. RG14711115
Rosenfeld Deposition September 2015
In The Iowa District Court In And For Poweshiek County
Russell D. Winburn, et al., Plaintiffs vs. Doug Hoksbergen, et al., Defendants
Case No. LALA002187
Rosenfeld Deposition August 2015
In The Circuit Court of Ohio County, West Virginia
Robert Andrews, et al. v. Antero, et al.
Civil Action No. 14-C-30000
Rosenfeld Deposition June 2015
In The Iowa District Court for Muscatine County
Laurie Freeman et. al. Plaintiffs vs. Grain Processing Corporation, Defendant Case No. 4980
Rosenfeld Deposition May 2015
In the Circuit Court of the $17^{\text {th }}$ Judicial Circuit, in and For Broward County, Florida Walter Hinton, et. al. Plaintiff, vs. City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, a Municipality, Defendant. Case No. CACE07030358 (26)
Rosenfeld Deposition December 2014
In the County Court of Dallas County Texas
Lisa Parr et al, Plaintiff, vs. Aruba et al, Defendant.
Case No. cc-11-01650-E
Rosenfeld Deposition: March and September 2013
Rosenfeld Trial April 2014
In the Court of Common Pleas of Tuscarawas County Ohio
John Michael Abicht, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Republic Services, Inc., et al., Defendants
Case No. 2008 CT 100741 (Cons. w/ 2009 CV 10 0987)
Rosenfeld Deposition October 2012
In the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama, Northern Division
James K. Benefield, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. International Paper Company, Defendant.
Civil Action No. 2:09-cv-232-WHA-TFM
Rosenfeld Deposition July 2010, June 2011
In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama
Jaeanette Moss Anthony, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Drummond Company Inc., et al., Defendants
Civil Action No. CV 2008-2076
Rosenfeld Deposition September 2010
In the United States District Court, Western District Lafayette Division
Ackle et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Citgo Petroleum Corporation, et al., Defendants.
Case No. 2:07CV1052
Rosenfeld Deposition July 2009

## EXHIBIT C

## LOZEAU

BY E-MAIL
September 13, 2023
Rick Caguiat
Community Development Director
Planning Commission Secretary
Community Development Department
390 Towne Centre Drive
Lathrop, California 95330
planning@ci.lathrop.ca.us
Re: Comment on Planning Commission Agenda Items No. 8.3 Regarding the Ashley Furniture Project (Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-23-08; Site Plan Review No. SPR 23-09)

Dear Mr. Caguiat and Honorable Members of the Planning Commission:
I am writing on behalf of Laborers' International Union of North America, Local Union No. 73 ("LIUNA") regarding the proposed Ashley Furniture Project proposed to be located at the northwest corner of Dos Reis Rd and Manthey Road. The Planning Commission staff have determined that the project is exempt from the requirement for preparation of environmental documents pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Guidelines, Section 15183 and Public Resources Code § 21083.3. However, after reviewing the Environmental Checklist and relevant appendices prepared for the Project, and the 2022 General Plan Update EIR that the Project relies upon, we conclude that the Project does not meet the requirements for an exemption under CEQA Guideline § 15183 and PRC § 21083.3. LIUNA respectfully requests that the Planning Commission not recommend approval of each of the agenda items addressed by the proposed exemption and, in particular, the proposed Ashley Furniture Project, and instead request staff to prepare the necessary environmental documents under CEQA.

## I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project proposes to construct and operate a $1,486,607$ square foot industrial building including a mix of retail, office/call center, and warehouse and distribution uses. About 110,000 square feet would be dedicated to retail use, 24,000 square feet to office and call-center uses, and 1,352,347 square feet to warehouse and distribution center uses.
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The Project proposes to construct approximately 2,046 parking spaces throughout the development site, with 942 spaces for passenger vehicles and 1,104 spaces for truck trailer parking. The Project expects to generate 2,798 daily passenger vehicle trips, including 203 a.m. peak hour trips ( 124 inbound, 79 outbound) and 255 p.m. peak hour trips ( 110 inbound, 145 outbound) for passenger vehicles. Another 680 daily truck trips also are expected, including 95 a.m. peak hour trips and 45 p.m. peak hour trips.

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

To achieve its objectives of environmental protection, CEQA has a three-tiered structure. 14 CCR § 15002(k); Committee to Save the Hollywoodland Specific Plan v. City of Los Angeles (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 1168, 1185-86 ("Hollywoodland"). First, if a project falls into an exempt category, or it can be seen with certainty that the activity in question will not have a significant effect on the environment, no further agency evaluation is required. Id. Second, if there is a possibility the project will have a significant effect on the environment, the agency must perform an initial threshold study. Id.; 14 CCR $\S 15063(\mathrm{a})$. If the study indicates that there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment the agency may issue a negative declaration. Id.; 14 CCR §§ 15063(b)(2), 15070. Finally, if the project will have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report ("EIR") is required. Id.

Here, since the City purports to exempt the Project from CEQA entirely, the first step of the CEQA process applies. "Exemptions to CEQA are narrowly construed and '[e]xemption categories are not to be expanded beyond the reasonable scope of their statutory language." Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish \& Game Com. (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105,125 . The determination as to the appropriate scope of an exemption is a question of law subject to independent, or de novo, review. San Lorenzo Valley Community Advocates for Responsible Education v. San Lorenzo Valley Unified School Dist., (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1356, 1375 ("[Q]uestions of interpretation or application of the requirements of CEQA are matters of law. Thus, for example, interpreting the scope of a CEQA exemption presents 'a question of law, subject to de novo review by this court."')

Here, the City proposes that the Project is exempt from CEQA review under Section 15183 and PRC § 21083.3. However, as discussed below, the use of these streamlining provisions is improper, and instead, a full CEQA analysis, such as an EIR, must be prepared for this Project.

## III. DISCUSSION

## a. The City Incorrectly Applied CEQA's Section 15183 Categorical Exemption to the Project and Thus a Full CEQA Analysis is Required.

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act allows a project to avoid environmental review if it is "consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified . . . except as might be necessary to examine whether there are projectspecific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site." 14 CCR 15183 (emphasis added). See PRC § 21083.3(b). The intention of this section is to "streamline[]" CEQA review for projects and avoid the preparation of repetitive documents. While the City refers to these provisions as exemptions from CEQA, environmental review is still required for various types of impacts, including those "peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located," those which "were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR," "are potentially significant offsite impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR," or "[a]re previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR."

Section (f) of section 15183 states that a Project's environmental effects are not peculiar to a project if "uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted" which serve to mitigate environmental impacts, "unless substantial new information shows that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the environmental effect." The standard set forth by the statute for this analysis is substantial evidence.

Here, there is substantial evidence demonstrating that the Project will have significant impacts which were not addressed in the EIR prepared for the 2022 General Plan Update. Section 15183 therefore does not apply, and the City must prepare appropriate CEQA documents for this Project.

## b. The City Must Prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations With Regard to This Project.

The 2022 General Plan Update concluded that several of the impacts identified as a result of the General Plan Update project were significant and unavoidable. These impacts included agricultural resources, air quality, greenhouse gas, and traffic noise impacts. In the Environmental Checklist prepared for the Project, the City acknowledges these significant and unavoidable impacts, but states that:

Impacts from buildout of the General Plan including cumulative impacts associated with development and buildout of the CLSP Phase 2 plan area

Comment re: Ashley Furniture Project
City of Lathrop
September 13, 2023
Planning Commission Hearing
and the warehouse Project site, as proposed, were fully addressed in the General Plan EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2021100139), and implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new or altered impacts beyond those addressed in the General Plan EIR.

Envt'I Checklist, p. 13. Similar statements are repeated for each of the specific unavoidable significant impacts. This conclusion does not, however, address all of the City's obligations to grapple with acknowledged significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts.

In the case of Communities for a Better Environment v. Cal. Resources Agency, the court of appeal held that, although tiering may allow a later project to rely on the environmental analysis contained in a prior program-level EIR, that procedure does not relieve the agency of acknowledging the significant and unavoidable impacts and reconsidering its statement of overriding considerations. As the Court explained:

The section appears to allow an agency, in approving a later project that has significant unavoidable impacts, to forego making a statement of overriding considerations specifically tied to that project. This is contrary to CEQA law. CEQA section 21094, subdivision (d) requires agencies that approve a later project to comply with CEQA section 21081. Under CEQA section 21081, an agency approving a project with significant environmental effects must find that each effect will be mitigated or avoided, or "that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the ... effect[] ...." 65 The requirement of a statement of overriding considerations is central to CEQA's role as a public accountability statute; it requires public officials, in approving environmentally detrimental projects, to justify their decisions based on counterbalancing social, economic or other benefits, and to point to substantial evidence in support. ${ }^{66}$ Under Guidelines section 15152(f)(3)(C), however, an agency apparently could adopt one statement of overriding considerations for a prior, more general EIR, and then avoid future political accountability by approving later, more specific projects with significant unavoidable impacts pursuant to the prior EIR and statement of overriding considerations. Even though a prior EIR's analysis of environmental effects may be subject to being incorporated in a later EIR for a later, more specific project, the responsible public officials must still go on the record and explain specifically why they are approving the later project despite its significant unavoidable impacts.

Communities for a Better Env't v. California Res. Agency, 103 Cal. App. 4th 98, 124-25, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 441 (2002), as modified (Nov. 21, 2002), and disapproved of on other grounds by Berkeley Hillside Pres. v. City of Berkeley, 60 Cal. 4th 1086, 343 P.3d 834 (2015).

The same reasoning applies to the implementation of Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3 and 14 Cal. Admin. Code § 15183. The Project, based on its reliance on the 2022 General Plan Update EIR, will have cumulative impacts on agricultural resources, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic noise. Although sections 21083 and 15183 provide for streamlining of the environmental review of a subsequent project, neither section relieves the City from its obligation to make a statement of overriding considerations for the Project. PRC § 21081. Prior to recommending the Project and applying the streamlining provisions, the Planning Commission should prepare a statement of overriding considerations supported by substantial evidence and which evaluates whether any additional feasible mitigation measures applicable to this specific project should be required in order to address the acknowledged cumulative impacts.

## c. The Project Will Have Project-Specific Significant Effects Which Were Not Addressed in the 2022 General Plan Update EIR.

LIUNA is concerned that a number of significant environmental impacts peculiar to the Project were not addressed in the 2022 General Plan Update EIR. As a result, Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3 and 14 Cal. Admin. Code § 15183 do not apply and either a mitigated negative declaration or EIR must be prepared to address these unanalyzed impacts.

## i. Biological Resources

According to the 2022 General Plan EIR, the federally-listed, endangered valley elderberry longhorn beetle (Desmocerus californicus dimorphus) did not occur within one-mile of the planning area. GP EIR, p. 3.4-15. As a result, there is no focused discussion in the 2022 General Plan EIR on any impacts to this federally-listed species. In general, the 2022 General Plan EIR concludes that there will be no significant impacts to listed species from the General Plan's implementation. GP EIR, p. 2.4-28 -3.4-29. The valley elderberry longhorn beetle relies on a particular host plant for its survival - the red or blue elderberry. See Biological Resources Analysis Report, p. 18. The reconnaissance survey conducted for the Biological Resources Analysis observed a 6 -foot by 15 -foot elderberry shrub on the property. Id., p. 19. The presence of that host plant, the enhanced likelihood of the presence of the endangered valley elderberry longhorn beetle, and the heightened risk of adverse affects on the host plant or potentially present beetles are not addressed as a significant impact in the 2022 General Plan EIR and these effects are peculiar to the Project site. Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3. Given these facts peculiar to the site, it "might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site." 14 CCR 15183.

Likewise, the observed presence of a Swainson's hawk foraging on the project site and nesting within 20 feet of the site also results in obvious effects peculiar to the
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project site, including not only the direct loss of foraging habitat but also disturbances from construction activities at the site and a dramatic increase in vehicles using Dos Reis Road to access the project once it is operational. Because impacts to Swainson's hawks were not addressed as significant impacts in the 2022 General Plan EIR and impact to a Swainson's hawk is peculiar to the site, those potential impacts must be addressed in a proper CEQA environmental review document and reliance on Pub. Res. Code $\S 21083.3$ and 14 Cal . Admin. Code $\S 15183$ is inappropriate.

Given the very limited reconnaissance-level survey performed on a single day at the Project site on May 5, 2021, LIUNA is concerned that there are numerous other listed and sensitive species foraging or located at the Project site. No effort has been made to determine the current presence of burrowing owls at the site. The past presence of red-tailed hawks and white-tailed kites foraging at the site also excludes the proposed streamlining exemption. A current and more robust survey of the Project site is necessary for the City to make any decision on these potential impacts based on substantial evidence.

In addition, the 2022 General Plan EIR does not identify the significant potential impact of the Project's thousands of trucks and car trips on wildlife from vehicle collisions with wildlife. This impact is peculiar to the Project given its proposed 2,798 daily passenger vehicle trips and 680 daily truck trips which will lead to wildlife collisions in the vicinity of the Project. Because this project-specific direct and cumulative effect was not addressed at all in the 2022 General Plan EIR, it must be addressed in an EIR or potentially a mitigated negative declaration for the Project. See PRC § 21083.3(c) ("Nothing in this section affects any requirement to analyze potentially significant offsite impacts and cumulative impacts of the project not discussed in the prior environmental impact report with respect to the general plan").

## ii. Energy

The 2022 General Plan EIR's discussion of the General Plan's energy impacts boils down to stating that by complying with California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards ("CalGreen"), promoting the use of renewable energy sources and encouraging public transportation and bicycle use, and the fact that PG\&E will generally make progress on adding new renewable energy sources to its portfolio, projects within the planning area will not have energy impacts. GP EIR, p. 3.7-41-3.7-42. The Environmental Checklist focuses on the Ashley Furniture Project's compliance with CalGreen and PG\&E's long-term efforts. Env't Checklist, p. 66. None of these considerations address the energy effects that are peculiar to a 1.4 million square feet furniture distribution and retail center.

The standard under CEQA is whether the Project would result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Failing to undertake "an investigation into renewable energy options that might be available or appropriate for a
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project" violates CEQA. California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 213. Energy conservation under CEQA is defined as the "wise and efficient use of energy." CEQA Guidelines, app. F, § I. The "wise and efficient use of energy" is achieved by "(1) decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, (2) decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas and oil, and (3) increasing reliance on renewable energy resources." Id.

Noting compliance with the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Cal.Code Regs., tit. 24, part 6 (Title 24) does not constitute an adequate analysis of energy impacts. Ukiah Citizens for Safety First v. City of Ukiah (2016) 248 Cal.App.4th 256, 264-65. Similarly, the court in City of Woodland held unlawful an energy analysis that relied on compliance with Title 24, that failed to assess transportation energy impacts, and that failed to address renewable energy impacts. California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland, 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 209-13. As such, the General Plan EIR's reliance on Title 24 compliance does not address the proposed furniture warehouse Project's energy impacts. The energy effects of the Project are, by definition, peculiar to the Project. Given the vast expanse of roofing provided by the proposed Project, any evaluation of its energy impacts cannot ignore the obvious feasibility of an array of solar panels on the roof or covering the extensive parking proposed at the site. Energy efficiency, in the context of the Proposed project and site would require the consideration and implementation of sufficient solar panels to meet all of the Project's direct electricity demand, as well as solar power that would offset the considerable GHG and other air pollution emissions that will result from the thousands of trucks and cars driving to and from the Project every day once it's operational.

The Environmental Checklist contains no discussion of the project's cost effectiveness in terms of energy requirements. There is no discussion of energy consuming equipment and processes that will be used during the construction or operation of the project. The project's energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction and operation were not identified. The effect of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity has not been addressed. As such, the Environmental Checklist's conclusions are unsupported by the necessary discussions of the Project's energy impacts under CEQA. An EIR or possibly a mitigated negative declaration must be prepared to assess these impacts.

## iii. Greenhouse Gases and Air Quality.

The 2022 General Plan EIR did not project air pollution emissions for any given project that would be allowed by the plan. Instead, it identifies the implementation measure in the General Plan that the City "[review development, infrastructure, and planning projects for consistency with SJVAPCD requirements during the CEQA review process." GP EIR, p. 3.3-35 (RR-6a). The General Plan and the EIR go on to further require that:

Require project applicants to prepare air quality analyses to address SJVAPCD and General Plan requirements, which include analysis and identification of:
A. Air pollutant emissions associated with the project during construction, project operation, and cumulative conditions.
B. Potential exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants.
C. Significant air quality impacts associated with the project for construction, project operation, and cumulative conditions.
D. Mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to less than significant or the maximum extent feasible where impacts cannot be mitigated to less than significant.
ld. Although the Environmental Checklist purports to describe these evaluation efforts, the Checklist does not provide any of the input files for the air pollution modeling conducted for the proposed Project. Only the output files are provided. Environmental Checklist, Attachment I, p. 162. Given the size of the warehouse and the number of expected daily truck trips, LIUNA is skeptical that the emissions forecasts identified for its construction and operation can be substantiated. Before making a recommendation to the Council, the Planning Commission should require staff and the applicant to share their input files for the CalEEMod modeling in order for the public to be able to assess the accuracy of the model outputs and whether or not the Project's may have a significant effect on air quality and GHG emissions and the extent of necessary mitigation measures as required by the General Plan.

## IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above comments, the City must prepare an EIR or, if appropriate, a mitigated negative declaration for the Project. LIUNA reserves its right to submit additional comments and evidence for any subsequent Planning Commission hearing or the City Council's consideration of the Project. Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,


Michael R. Lozeau
LOZEAU DRURY LLP
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September 28, 2023
VIA E-MAIL (TVARGAS@CI.LATHROP.CA.US,) \& U.S. MAIL
Mayor and City Council
City of Lathrop
Attn: City Clerk
390 Towns Centre Dr. Lathrop, CA 95330

Re: Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review for the Ashley Furniture Project to Allow for the Construction of an Approximately 1.5 Million Square Foot Concrete Tilt-Up Building Located within the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Area.

## Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

The District remains concerned with the Limited Industrial Zoning Districts behind the Lathrop High School site, as noted in our response to the Central Lathrop Specific Plan and therefore the proposed Ashley Furniture development project has the potential to impact the District. Lathrop High School is located immediately to the southwest of the project site on the southern side of Dos Reis. District staff has reviewed the buffer and screening requirements and finds the 73 -foot buffer requirements that include an 8 -foot solid wall in addition to pedestrian improvements along Dos Reis to be critical to provide for separation of uses. The District is supportive of the addition of the 8 -foot separated multi-use trail along the southern side of Dos Reis for improved pedestrian safety.
The District is in agreement with the circulation requirements that prohibit truck traffic on Dos Reis, and the requirement for traffic to be directed to S. Manthey Road as the access point to the project site. The District would request the City include MUSD in the review process and route any modification to existing lane striping plans that could impact District transportation. This coordination would ensure minimal impacts.
Please let us know if there is any additional information needed from MUSD to assist in the review process. Do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions at (209) 858-0858 or developerfees@musd.net.

Sincerely,


Victoria Bun
Chief Business and Information Officer
Manteca Unified school District

Cc: Rick Cagiuat, Director Community Development, via email (RCagiuat@cilathrop.ca.us)

# De Novo Planning Group 


October 31, 2023

Rick Caguiat, Community Development Director<br>City of Lathrop<br>390 Towne Centre Drive<br>Lathrop, CA 95330

## SUBJECT: Response to LIUNA Comments on the Ashley Warehouse CEQA Analysis

The City Council received written correspondence from Lozeau Drury, LLP, representing LIUNA regarding the City's environmental analysis for the Ashley Warehouse Project prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 (the "Environmental Analysis"). The comment letter incorrectly asserts that additional CEQA analysis must be completed for the Ashley Warehouse project, and the City must adopt a statement of overriding considerations.

## The City correctly applied Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines

The City relied on the exemption provisions provided under Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines. Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and corresponding State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 allows a streamlined environmental review process for projects that are consistent with the densities established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified. The Ashley Warehouse project is consistent with the City of Lathrop General Plan land uses and development intensities designated on the project site. As such, the application of CEQA to the approval of development projects, such as the proposed Ashley Project, shall be limited to effects on the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the Project and which were not addressed as significant effects in the prior environmental impact report, or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the prior environmental impact report. (Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3.) Further, an effect of a project on the environment is not considered peculiar to the parcel or the project, if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been adopted by the local agency with a finding that they will substantially mitigate that effect when applied to future projects. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15183(f).)

The lead agency must make a finding at a public hearing that any mitigation measures in the prior EIR that apply to the project's specific effects, and that the lead agency found to be feasible, will be undertaken. (Pub. Res. Code § 21083.3(c); State CEQA Guidelines § 15183(e).) The City has done that here, by incorporating relevant policies, actions, standards, and other mitigating requirements as Conditions of Approval for the Ashley Warehouse project. These requirements and standards are specifically identified throughout the Environmental Analysis the City prepared for the Ashley Warehouse project. Such a finding is not required for potentially significant environmental effects that are not considered peculiar to the parcel or the project if uniformly applied development policies or standards were previously adopted by the agency with a finding that the policies or standards would substantially mitigate the environmental effect when applied to future projects. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15183(f).) When the agency has failed to make such a finding previously, it can do so when it approves the later project.

Often, such certified prior EIRs are Program EIRs and, in fact, the factual questions as to whether project impacts fall within the scope of the prior EIR are very similar. As to reliance on a Program EIR, later activities are examined to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c).) As the commenter notes, if a later activity would result in environmental effects that were not examined in the
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Program EIR, the agency must prepare an initial study to determine whether an EIR or negative declaration is required to address those effects. (Id.) However, as is the case here, if a later activity would not have any effects that were not examined in the Program EIR (including any new or more severe impacts), the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the Program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required. (Id.)

Factors that an agency may consider in determining whether a later activity is within the scope of a Program EIR include "consistency of the later activity with the type of allowable land use, overall planned density and building intensity, geographic area analyzed for environmental impacts, and covered infrastructure as described in the program EIR." (State CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c).) An agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the Program EIR into later activities in the program. (Id.) "Where the later activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were within the scope of the program EIR." (Id.)

The City's Environmental Analysis complies with both Section 15183 and Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The commenter claims that an EIR is required for the Project. While the applicability of the exemption provided by State CEQA Guidelines 15183 does not turn on whether the City completes some form of preliminary review, here the City did use an environmental checklist which identifies whether or not each CEQA Appendix $G$ environmental checklist question, and its corresponding impacts, were adequately addressed in the Lathrop General Plan EIR, if there is a significant impact due to new information, or if the Project would result in a significant impact peculiar to the Project site that was not adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR. The Environmental Analysis identifies the applicable City of Lathrop development standards and policies that would apply to the proposed Project during both the construction and operational phases, identifies applicable state-level standards and requirements, and explains how the application of these uniformly applied standards and policies would ensure that no peculiar or sitespecific environmental impacts would occur.

## The Project would not result in site-specific biological impacts that cannot be mitigated through application of uniform standards and requirements

The Biological Resources Analysis Report (BRA) prepared by Olberding Environmental, dated May 2021, and updated on November 1, 2023, identified several special-status species having the potential to occur on the subject Property based on the presence of suitable habitat. In fact, several protected avian species were observed during the site visit but in a foraging capacity only. The BRA document was prepared to provide a preliminary or general assessment of biological habitats present on the subject property and to evaluate current wildlife usage of those habitats during a single day site visit. The intent of this document was to provide initial biological information and make recommendations for additional studies if suitable habitat for a particular species was present.

As indicated above, the BRA determined that there is a potential for impacts to several special-status species. In particular, it noted the presence of a Swainson's Hawk nest on the adjacent project. As such, mitigation for foraging habitat is normally required, in addition to a setback buffer during the nesting season for this species and additional survey requirements as contemplated in the City of Lathrop General Plan Update EIR. These requirements have been made conditions of approval for the project, as required by both the Lathrop General Plan and the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP).

It should also be recognized that resources agencies have determined that mitigation should proceed through the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP). In November of 2000, San
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Joaquin County adopted and began implementing the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJCOG 2000). The plan was developed to provide a strategy for balancing the protection of Open Space and wildlife with the protection of local landowners and agricultural practices. The SJMSCP, in accordance with ESA Section 10(a)(1)(B) and CESA Section 2081(b) Incidental Take Permits, provides compensation for the Conversion of Open Space to non-Open Space uses which affect the plant, fish and wildlife species covered by the SJMSCP. Species that are covered by the SJMSCP that have the potential to occur within the Property include VELB, Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, and the western mastiff bat as discussed in the BRA. Compliance with the requirements established in the SJMSCP, which are clearly identified in the BRA and Environmental Analysis, would ensure that impacts to special status species would be reduced to a less than significant level.

## The Project's Biological Report does not underestimate the diversity of species using the Project site.

The BRA was prepared to provide a preliminary or general assessment of biological habitats present on the subject property and to evaluate current wildlife usage of those habitats during the site visit. This information was provided for supporting informational purposes in order to initially assess biological resources and make recommendations for a more focused evaluation consistent with the SJMSCP and associated incidental take permits prior to grading.

## The Project's Biological Report accurately characterizes the existing environmental setting.

The site survey, literature and databases review conducted by Olberding Environmental provided adequate information to determine special-status species having potential to occur on the Property. As documented in the BRA, the site contains a single habitat type referred to as ruderal/ disturbed grassland. This habitat type is generally associated with agricultural fields and is generally dominated by non-native invasive species. The commenter did not provide any evidence that the assessment was inadequate, just because Dr. Smallwood saw different species using the Property than Olberding Environmental noted during their site visits.

## The Biological Report adequately analyzed and mitigated the Project's biological impacts due to habitat loss, wildlife movement, and vehicle collisions.

The BRA document was prepared to provide a preliminary or general assessment of biological habitats present on the subject property and to evaluate current wildlife usage of those habitats.

In its October 9 Letter, LIUNA summarizes the findings from Dr. Smallwood's review of the Project which jumbles a transportation and biological impact analysis to misleadingly suggest that only the Project will result in a certain number of wildlife roadway mortality incidents. This explanation, however, ignores the City of Lathrop's summary of the biological resource impacts discussed in the CEQA consistency analysis and reference to and incorporation of the findings from the City's General Plan Update EIR prepared in 2022. CEQA requires later activities to be "examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15168 (c).) Here, the City not only relied on the CEQA Consistency review under 15183 and its analysis of biological resources based on the BRA analysis, but it also incorporated by reference into the CEQA consistency analysis the General Plan Update EIR which anticipated development of the Property.

With respect to roadway wildlife fatalities, the CEQA Guidelines do not recognize this as an environmental impact. (See CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G.) Although an analysis of this impact is unwarranted, Olberding visited the project site again on October 25, 2023 and confirmed that few bird species were observed on roads surrounding the Property. No federally or state listed bird species were observed on the property other than a Swainson's hawk foraging on the Property. Habitat present on-site offers marginal foraging habitat for raptors. There is no evidence
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to support Dr. Smallwood's claim that the Project traffic would result in 6,151 roadway wildlife fatalities due to additional traffic only from the Project (traffic that was previously accounted for in the General Plan Update EIR).

No new species with potential to occur on the Property have been listed, no critical habitat has been designated that may be affected by the Project, and no project description changes that would change a level of potential effect were identified.

## The Project correctly relies on the SJMSCP to mitigate the Project's potential impacts to biological resources.

The SJMSCP, in accordance with ESA Section 10(a)(1)(B) and CESA Section 2081(b) Incidental Take Permits, provides compensation for the Conversion of Open Space to non-Open Space uses which affect the plant, fish and wildlife species covered by the SJMSCP. Species that are covered by the SJMSCP that have the potential to occur within the Property include VELB, Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, and the western mastiff bat.

The Project's impacts to biological resources would require compliance with the SJMSCP, as required by the General Plan update and the incidental take permits. It has been stated that the SJMSCP cannot be relied upon to mitigate the Project's impacts due to grossly deficient implementation and poor performance of the SJMSCP. We have not been provided any information as to SJMSCP mitigation requirements so we cannot fully evaluate the adequacy of these claims. There is no evidence that USFWS or CDFW have threatened to suspend or revoke the incidental take permits because the SJMSCP is not effective in mitigating impacts.

## The Project's potential biological impacts are mitigated via the application of uniformly applied standards and requirements, rendering the 15183 exemption appropriate

The recommendations in the initial BRA include preconstruction surveys for reptiles, birds, and burrowing owls. They are project requirements in order to ensure that direct take would not occur and to provide additional information as to the presence/absence of a particular species which had been identified as having potential to occur on the Property based on multiple factors. The BRA acknowledged that Swainson's Hawk foraging habitat will be negatively impacted when existing foraging habitat is converted to develop lands. Standard mitigation requires that adequate foraging habitat be permanent protected/preserved at an agency approved mitigation ratio and site consistent with the SJMSCP.

## The Project's potential Air Quality and Health Risk Impacts were properly evaluated

LIUNA (the commenter) asserts that the analysis of the Project's impacts to human health from emissions of toxic air contaminants is inadequate. Specifically, the commenter states that, for warehouses and distribution centers within 1,000 feet of planned residential uses or other sensitive receptors, the 2022 General Plan requires "requires the preparation of a Health Risk Assessment ("HRA") that meets the standards established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District ("SJVAPCD"). (2022 GP, p. 3.3-31 [LU-5c].). The commenter states that, that HRA did not comply with the standards established by OEHHA and, as a result, the Project's impacts had not been adequately evaluated.

Specifically, the commenter states that the environmental analysis failed to provide the exposure assumptions for the HRA, such as the age sensitivity factors ("ASF") or fraction of time at home ("FAH") values. The commenter also states that the environmental analysis failed to provide the dose and risk equation used to calculate the Project's cancer risks. (Id.) Without providing this equation, there is no way to verify that the HRA utilized the proper equation recommended by OEHHA.

The commenter also states that the HRA prepared for the Project failed to follow OEHHA guidance because it only analyzed the Project's operational cancer risks but not the Project's construction-related cancer risks.

With regard to operational HRA age sensitivity factors (ASF), it is important to note that such factors are calculated automatically by the HARP2 application, which was used for the HRA, consistent with OEHHA and SJVAPCD guidance. As described on page 3 of the previously developed HRA for the project, the health risks that were evaluated were a 70-year exposure, starting at the third trimester (for residential cancer risk) and a 40-year exposure starting at age 16 (for workplace cancer risk), which is fully consistent with SJVAPCD guidance. Separately, with regard to FAH values, the HRA conservatively assumed a 24 -hour per day (i.e. $100 \%$ ) FAH value for all scenarios; this is a highly conservative assumption, given that operations would almost certainly occur less than 24 hours per day (i.e. less than $100 \%$ of the time). Therefore, these assumptions, taken together, provide for a conservative assessment of the Project's operational cancer risk.

With regard to the commenter's claim that the environmental analysis "failed to provide the dose and risk equation used to calculate the Project's cancer risks", this is a moot point. This is because, consistent with OEHHA and SJVAPCD guidance, dose and risk equations are handled by the AERMOD and HARP2 models; separate 'dose and risk equation[s]' would be duplicative and inappropriate, given that the analysis of health risks is undertaken by the applicable models. Moreover, Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 of the previously developed HRA include the AERMOD Output File, and the HARP2 Output File, respectively, which allows for verification of the modeling parameters.

With regard to the commenter's claim that the Project failed to follow OEHHA guidance because it only analyzed the Project's operational cancer risks but ignored the Project's construction-related cancer risks, this comment is noted. While the SJVAPCD does not require an assessment of a project's construction-related cancer risks, in contrast to the commenter's claim, for the sake of a conservative assessment, a subsequent analysis of the Project's construction-related cancer risks is provided below. The parameters used for this subsequent construction-related health risk modeling in AERMOD and HARP2 are as follows:

## AERMOD:

- Six (6) Off-road Construction Vehicle volume sources;
- Release height: 10 feet;
- 24-hour fraction of time at-home (FAH) value.

HARP2

- Exposure duration: 70 year, starting at $3^{\text {rd }}$ trimester (Residential Cancer); 40 year, starting at age 16 (Workplace Cancer);
- Intake Rate Percentile: $95^{\text {th }}$ (High End);
- Pathways to Evaluate: Mandatory Minimum Pathways;
- Deposition Rate: $0.05 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ (uncontrolled sources).

The results of the construction HRA subsequently conducted for the Project are provided in the below table. The construction HRA uses conservative assumptions, such as a 24 -hour FAH value. As shown in the below table (Table A-1), construction health risks associated with the Project, in conjunction with the operational health risks associated with the Project, would remain below the applicable thresholds. It should be noted that the 'combined health risks' for residential cancer risk is less than the combination of the individual maximum operational-related and construction-related health risks, since the residential receptors with the highest operational-related health risks are not the same receptors as those with the highest construction-related health risks (and vice versa).
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Table A-1: Summary of Project Health Risks


Sources: AERMOD 11.2.0 (Lakes Environmental Software, 2023); and HARP-2 Air Dispersion and Risk Tool.
${ }^{1}$ The residential receptor with the highest construction-related health risk is the residence located at 14302 Harlan Rd.
${ }^{2}$ The combined health risks are less than the combination of the maximum operational-related and constructionrelated health risks, since the residential receptor with the highest operational-related health risk (located at 12965 Manthey Road) is not the same receptor as the receptor with the highest construction-related health risk (and vice versa).
${ }^{3}$ The residential receptor with the highest combined operational-related and construction-related health risk is located at 14302 Harlan Road.

Furthermore, the Construction Emissions Calculations, the AERMOD Output File, and the HARP2 Output file for the construction HRA is provided in Appendices A through C of this Response to Comments chapter, respectively. With this supplemental information, the commenter's claim that the analysis could underestimate the Project's health impacts is unsubstantiated. Furthermore, the commenter's claim that the HRA does not comply with the OEHHA standards as required by the 2022 General Plan, and that the City lacks substantial evidence to conclude that the Project will not result in specific health impacts, is also unsubstantiated. No further response to this comment is warranted.

## The Project would not result in Energy-Related impacts

The commenter states that the environmental analysis focuses on the Project's compliance with CalGreen and PG\&E's long-term efforts, but that this does not address the energy effects that are particular to the project itself,

This comment is noted. A supplemental energy analysis is provided below. The below supplemental energy analysis includes a more detailed qualitative and quantitative discussion of the energy effects that are particular to the Project itself, and addresses some additional issues, consistent with requests of the commenter.

According to the CEQA Guidelines, the means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. In particular, the proposed project would be considered "wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary" if it were to violate State and federal energy standards and/or result in significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy inefficiencies, energy intensiveness of materials, effects on local and regional energy supplies or on requirements for additional capacity, compliance with existing energy standards, effects on energy resources, or transportation energy use requirements. In addition, the project could have a significant energy impact if it would conflict or create an inconsistency with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

The proposed warehouse project includes various characteristics that reduce the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy. For example, the proposed project would comply with all of the energy efficiency requirements of the latest version of the California Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards. Moreover, it should be noted that, over time, electrification of the vehicles will increase due to state requirements, and state and national trends.

The amount of energy used by the proposed warehouse project during operation would include the amount of energy used by project buildings and outdoor lighting, and the fuel used by vehicle trips generated during Project construction and operation, fuel used by off-road construction vehicles during construction activities, and fuel used by project maintenance activities during project operation. The following discussion provides a detailed calculation of energy usage expected for the proposed project, as provided by applicable modelling software (i.e. CalEEMod v2022.1 and the CARB EMFAC2021).
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## Electricity and Natural Gas

Electricity and natural gas used by the proposed warehouse project would be used primarily to generate energy for the warehouse building, as well as for outdoor parking lot lighting. "Energy" is one of the categories that was modeled for GHG emissions. As also shown in the CaIEEMod modeling outputs, the proposed project is anticipated to consume approximately $155,122 \mathrm{kWh}$ of electricity per year and approximately $82,578 \mathrm{kBTU}$ per of natural gas per year. Moreover, this is likely a conservative estimate, given that the CalEEMod model does not account for the latest version of Title 24.

On-road Vehicles (Operation)

The proposed warehouse project would generate vehicle trips (i.e., passenger vehicles for employees and heavyduty trucks for hauling) during its operational phase. Requirements to limit the idling of vehicles and equipment would result in fuel savings. Similarly, compliance with applicable State laws and regulations would limit idling and a part of a comprehensive regulatory framework that is implemented by the CARB. A description of project operational on-road mobile energy usage is provided below.

De Novo Planning Group used fleet mix data from the CalEEMod (v.2022.1) output for the proposed project, and Year 2025 gasoline and diesel MPG (miles per gallon) factors for individual vehicle classes as provided by EMFAC2021, to derive weighted average gasoline and diesel MPG factors for the vehicle fleet as a whole. Based on these calculations, as provided in Appendix D, upon full buildout, the proposed project would generate operational vehicle trips that would use a total of approximately 481 gallons of gasoline and 1,113 gallons of diesel per day, or 175,665 gallons of gasoline and 406,148 gallons of diesel per year.

The proposed warehouse would be designed and constructed in accordance with the City's latest adopted energy efficiency standards, which are based on the State's Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards for Nonresidential Buildings and Green Building Code Standards. These standards include minimum energy efficiency requirements related to building envelope, mechanical systems (e.g., heating, ventilation, and air conditioning [HVAC] and water heating systems), and indoor and outdoor lighting, are widely regarded as the some of the most advanced and stringent building energy efficiency standards in the country. Moreover, as specified in Chapter 5, Part 11 of the Title 24 standards, the proposed project would be required to incorporate electrical conduit to facilitate future installation of EV charging infrastructure. In addition, as specified in Subchapter 6, Part 6 of the Title 24 standards, the proposed project would be required to design the proposed buildings to structurally accommodate future installation of a rooftop solar system. As such, the design of the proposed project would facilitate the future commitment to renewable energy resources. Therefore, building energy consumption would not be considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

## On-road Vehicles (Construction)

The proposed warehouse would also generate on-road vehicle trips during project construction (from construction workers and vendors travelling to and from the project site). De Novo Planning Group estimated the vehicle fuel consumed during these trips based on the assumed construction schedule, vehicle trip lengths and number of workers per construction phase as provided by CalEEMod, and Year 2023 gasoline and diesel MPG factors provided by EMFAC2021 (year 2023 factors were used to represent a conservative analysis, as the energy efficiency of construction activities is anticipated to improve over time). For the sake of simplicity and to be conservative, it was assumed that all construction worker light duty passenger cars and truck trips use gasoline as a fuel source, and all medium and heavy-duty vendor trucks use diesel fuel. Table A-2, below, describes gasoline and diesel fuel consumed during each construction phase (in aggregate). As shown, the vast majority of on-road mobile vehicle fuel used during the construction of the proposed project would occur during the building construction phase. See Appendix D of document for a detailed accounting of construction on-road vehicle fuel usage estimates.
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Table A-2: On-road Mobile Fuel USE by Project Construction Activities - By Phase

| Construction Phase | Total Gallons of Gasoline <br> Fuel(b) | Total Gallons of Diesel <br> Fuel(b) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site Preparation | 1,328 | - |
| Grading | 1,420 | - |
| Building Construction | 429 | 388 |
| Paving | 618 | - |
| Architectural Coatings | 69 | - |
| Total | 3,864 | 388 |

Note: ${ }^{(a)}$ Provided by CalEEMod Output. ${ }^{(b)}$ See Appendix D of this EIR for Further Detail Source: CalEEMod (v.2022.1); EMFAC2021.
Off-road Equipment (Construction)
Off-road construction equipment would use diesel fuel during the construction phase of the proposed project. A nonexhaustive list of off-road constructive equipment expected to be used during the construction phase of the proposed Project includes: forklifts, generator sets, tractors, excavators, and dozers. Based on the total amount of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions expected to be generated by the proposed Project (as provided by the CalEEMod output), and standard conversion factors (as provided by the U.S. Energy Information Administration), the proposed Project would use a total of approximately 107,094 gallons of diesel fuel for off-road construction equipment. Detailed calculations are provided in Appendix D.
State laws and regulations would limit idling from both on-road and off-road diesel-powered equipment and are part of a comprehensive regulatory framework that is implemented by the CARB. Additionally, as a practical matter, it is reasonable to assume that the overall construction schedule and process would be designed to be as efficient as feasible in order to avoid excess monetary costs. For example, equipment and fuel are not typically used wastefully due to the added expense associated with renting the equipment, maintaining it, and fueling it. Therefore, the opportunities for further future efficiency gains during construction are limited. For the foregoing reasons, it is anticipated that the construction phase of the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy.

## Other

The project is anticipated to install a solar photovoltaic (PV) roof system, including on-site PV connection to the local electric grid. This would be consistent with, at minimum, state requirements. This addition of renewable energy to a currently vacant site would help the State make progress on adding new renewable energy resources within the state.

Separately, it should be noted that the proposed warehouse would not be anticipated to result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources for several reasons. For example, the proposed warehouse would generate a substantial amount of economic activity on a site that currently produces virtually no economic activity (being a vacant site); furthermore, the usage of energy resources on the site would be to dense, economically productive activities. The addition of on-site renewable energy resources would reduce any risk that the proposed project would results in any kind of wasteful or inefficient usage of energy resources.
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It should further be noted that the proposed project would, over time, take advantage of the increasing electrification and improved energy efficiency of the vehicle fleet, which is anticipated to improve considerably over time, due to technological advancements as well as state requirements.

Lastly, the proposed project is anticipated to operational throughout the day and night, which would reduce potential issues associated with adding inordinate demand to typical 'peak' hours for the electric utility (i.e. PG\&E).

## Conclusion

The proposed project would use energy resources for the operation of the project warehouse building (natural gas and electricity), outdoor lighting (electricity), on-road vehicle trips (e.g. gasoline and diesel fuel) generated by the proposed project, and off-road and on-road construction activities associated with the proposed project (e.g. diesel fuel). Each of these activities would require the use of energy resources. The proposed project would be responsible for conserving energy, including through project features, as well as through the implementation of statewide and local measures.

The proposed project would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations regulating energy usage. For example, PG\&E, the electric and natural gas provider to the proposed project, is responsible for the mix of energy resources used to provide electricity for its customers, and it is in the process of implementing the statewide RPS to increase the proportion of renewable energy (e.g. solar and wind) within its energy portfolio. PG\&E has already achieved renewable energy mix of $50 \%$ (as of 2021$)^{1}$, and is on track to achieve the required renewable energy mix of $60 \%$ by 2030 . Other statewide measures, including those intended to improve the energy efficiency of the statewide passenger and heavy-duty truck vehicle fleet (e.g. the Pavley Bill and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard), would improve vehicle fuel economies, thereby conserving gasoline and diesel fuel. These energy savings would continue to accrue over time. Moreover, the proposed project would comply with the City's General Plan goals, objectives and policies related to energy conservation that are relevant to this analysis.

The proposed project would comply with all existing energy standards and would not be expected to result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources. For these reasons, the proposed project would not cause an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy resources nor cause a significant impact on any of the energyrelated thresholds as described by the CEQA Guidelines.

As described above, the supplemental energy analysis provided above addresses transportation energy impacts, renewable energy impacts, energy efficiency, cost effectiveness in terms of energy requirements, a discussion of the Project's energy-consuming equipment and processes that would be used during the construction or operation of the Project, and the effect of the Project on peak and base period demands for electricity (as requested by the commenter). No further response to this comment is warranted.

## A Statement of Overriding Considerations is not required

CEQA only requires a statement of overriding considerations when a lead agency determines that a project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093). The General Plan EIR evaluated full buildout of the Lathrop General Plan and Land Use Map, both of which this project is consistent with. While full buildout of the entire Lathrop General Plan was determined to result in some significant and unavoidable impacts in the General Plan EIR, that EIR has been certified, and a statement of overriding considerations was adopted for the General Plan and the associated EIR.

[^5]Subjert: Response tollUNA Ashely Warchouse CEQA Comments
Date: Octobor 31,2022
In this instance, the environmental analysis completed for the proposed Ashley Warehouse project correctly concluded that this individual project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those that were analyzed and disclosed in the General Plan EIR, and that the project would not result in any project-specific significant and unavoidable impacts. As such, there is no need for the City to prepare further environmental review or adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the proposed Ashley Warehouse project.

## Construction Emissions (Off-Road Equipment)

Phase
Site Preparation (2023)
Ste Preparation (2024)
Grading (2024)
Building Construction (2024)
Building Construction (2025)
Paving (2025)
Architectural Coating (2025)

| Average Daily PM10 | Days |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $0.32 \mathrm{lbs} /$ day | 70 5ource: CalEEMod (v2022.1) |
|  | $0.42 \mathrm{lbs} /$ day | 91 Source: CalEEMod (v2022.1) |
|  | 0.61 lbs/day | 155 Source: CaIEEM od (v2022.1) |
|  | $0.01 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{day}$ | 9 Source: CalEEMod (v2022.1) |
|  | $0.17 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{day}$ | 141 5ource: CalEEMod (v2022.1) |
|  | $0.09 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{day}$ | 90 Source: CalEEMod (v2022.1) |
|  | $0.01 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{day}$ | 121 Source: CalEEMod (v2022.1) |
|  | 88.54 lbs (total) |  |

Given 27 months of total construction activities:
\%)
Per Volume 5ource (of 6):
(1)

```
** Lakes Environmental AERMOD MPI
**
******************************************
**
** AERMOD Input Produced by:
** AERMOD View Ver. 11.2.0
** Lakes Environmental Software Inc.
** Date: 10/26/2023
** File: C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC (DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley
Warehouse - Revised (Construction)\Ashley Warehouse.ADI
**
******************************************
**
**
********************************************
** AERMOD Control Pathway
******************************************
**
**
CO STARTING
    TITLEONE C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC (DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley
    MODELOPT CONC FLAT
    AVERTIME }1\mathrm{ PERIOD
    POLLUTID OTHER
    RUNORNOT RUN
    ERRORFIL "Ashley Warehouse.err"
CO FINISHED
**
*******************************************
** AERMOD Source Pathway
****************************************
**
**
SO STARTING
** Source Location **
** Source ID - Type - X Coord. - Y Coord. **
    LOCATION VOL1 VOLUME 650380.000 4188444.670 0.0
** DESCRSRC Construction Volume Source (1)
    LOCATION VOL2 VOLUME 649783.770 4188428.620 0.0
** DESCRSRC Construction Volume Source (2)
    LOCATION VOL3 VOLUME 649783.770 4188630.660 0.0
** DESCRSRC Construction Volume Source (3)
    LOCATION VOL4 VOLUME 650380.000 4188635.710 0.0
** DESCRSRC Construction Volume Source (4)
    LOCATION VOL5 VOLUME 650090.120 4188630.380
** DESCRSRC Construction Volume Source (5)
    LOCATION VOL6 VOLUME 650096.690 4188433.810 0.0
** DESCRSRC Construction Volume Source (6)
** Source Parameters **
    SRCPARAM VOL1 
```

```
\begin{tabular}{lllll} 
SRCPARAM VOL2 & 1.0 & 3.048 & 35.240 & 0.000 \\
SRCPARAM VOL3 & 1.0 & 3.048 & 35.514 & 0.000 \\
SRCPARAM VOL4 & 1.0 & 3.048 & 36.481 & 0.000 \\
SRCPARAM VOL5 & 1.0 & 3.048 & 35.253 & 0.000 \\
SRCPARAM VOL6 & 1.0 & 3.048 & 37.370 & 0.000
\end{tabular}
```

SRCGROUP VOL1 SRCGROUP VOL2 SRCGROUP VOL3 SRCGROUP VOL4 SRCGROUP VOL5 SRCGROUP VOL6

VOL1
VOL2
VOL3
VOL4
VOL5
VOL6
** AERMOD Receptor Pathway
*******************************************
**
**
RE STARTING
** DESCRREC "" ""
DISCCART 649676.34 4188314.55
DISCCART 649629.66 4188294.84
DISCCART 649810.15 4188312.48
DISCCART 649364.10 4188360.20
DISCCART 649327.80 4188355.01
DISCCART 649380.70 4188758.52
DISCCART 650495.81 4188841.51
DISCCART 650597.47 4188832.17
DISCCART 650536.27 4188878.85
DISCCART 650577.76 4188877.81
DISCCART 650602.66 4188860.18
DISCCART 650610.95 4188880.93
DISCCART 650638.10 4188858.53
DISCCART 650664.10 4188331.03
DISCCART 650668.72 4188350.83
DISCCART 650677.96 4188379.86
DISCCART 650699.74 4188414.84
DISCCART 650758.47 4188658.36
DISCCART 650765.73 4188678.82
DISCCART 650773.65 4188706.54
DISCCART 650778.27 4188726.34
DISCCART 650805.33 4188805.53
DISCCART 650806.65 4188824.01
DISCCART 650811.27 4188843.81
DISCCART 650814.57 4188862.29
DISCCART 650846.24 4188924.98
DISCCART 650850.86 4188951.38
DISCCART 650854.82 4188976.46
DISCCART 650698.00 4188307.32
DISCCART 650692.60 4188291.80

```
```

    DISCCART 650724.82 4189245.80
    DISCCART 650726.07 4189273.37
    DISCCART 650856.27 4189006.30
    DISCCART 650857.23 4189022.60
    DISCCART 650859.15 4189041.29
    DISCCART 650859.15 4189058.54
    DISCCART 650860.58 4189076.28
    DISCCART 650861.54 4189094.49
    DISCCART 650857.71 4189113.19
    DISCCART 650847.16 4189118.94
    DISCCART 650848.12 4189134.76
    DISCCART 650850.04 4189155.37
    DISCCART 650851.48 4189171.66
    DISCCART 650853.87 4189184.12
    DISCCART 650856.75 4189199.46
    DISCCART 650857.71 4189213.36
    DISCCART 650860.58 4189226.30
    DISCCART 650862.50 4189242.60
    DISCCART 650865.38 4189258.42
    DISCCART 650867.77 4189275.19
    DISCCART 650868.73 4189291.49
    DISCCART 650872.09 4189309.23
    DISCCART 650874.00 4189325.04
    DISCCART 650875.92 4189340.38
    DISCCART 650878.80 4189355.24
    DISCCART 650881.19 4189373.45
    DISCCART 650884.55 4189390.71
    DISCCART 650888.86 4189407.01
    DISCCART 650889.82 4189427.14
    DISCCART 650891.74 4189443.43
    DISCCART 650895.09 4189461.17
    DISCCART 650898.45 4189475.55
    DISCCART 650898.45 4189489.93
    DISCCART 650902.28 4189504.31
    DISCCART 650709.41 4188344.56
    DISCCART 650722.45 4188284.03
    DISCCART 650745.73 4188280.30
    DISCCART 650735.49 4188223.50
    DISCCART 650721.52 4188167.62
    ** DESCRREC "UCART1" "Receptors generated from Uniform Cartesian Grid"
DISCCART 650525.76 4188133.34
DISCCART 651125.76 4188133.34
DISCCART 649125.76 4188183.34
DISCCART 649225.76 4188183.34
DISCCART 649325.76 4188183.34
DISCCART 649425.76 4188183.34
DISCCART 649525.76 4188183.34
DISCCART 649625.76 4188183.34
DISCCART 649725.76 4188183.34
DISCCART 649825.76 4188183.34

```

DISCCART 649925.764188183 .34
DISCCART 650025.764188183 .34
DISCCART \(650125.76 \quad 4188183.34\)
DISCCART 650225.764188183 .34
DISCCART 650325.764188183 .34
DISCCART 650425.764188183 .34
DISCCART 650525.764188183 .34
DISCCART 650625.764188183 .34
DISCCART 650725.764188183 .34
DISCCART 650825.764188183 .34
DISCCART 651125.764188183 .34
DISCCART 649125.764188233 .34
DISCCART 649225.764188233 .34
DISCCART \(649325.76 \quad 4188233.34\)
DISCCART 649425.764188233 .34
DISCCART 649525.764188233 .34
DISCCART 649625.764188233 .34
DISCCART 649725.764188233 .34
DISCCART 649825.764188233 .34
DISCCART 649925.764188233 .34
DISCCART 650025.764188233 .34
DISCCART 650125.764188233 .34
DISCCART 650225.764188233 .34
DISCCART 650325.764188233 .34
DISCCART 650425.764188233 .34
DISCCART 650525.764188233 .34
DISCCART \(650625.76 \quad 4188233.34\)
DISCCART 650725.764188233 .34
DISCCART 650825.764188233 .34
DISCCART \(651125.76 \quad 4188233.34\)
DISCCART 649125.764188283 .34
DISCCART 649225.764188283 .34
DISCCART 649325.764188283 .34
DISCCART 649425.764188283 .34
DISCCART 649525.764188283 .34
DISCCART 649625.764188283 .34
DISCCART 649725.764188283 .34
DISCCART 649825.764188283 .34
DISCCART 649925.764188283 .34
DISCCART 650025.764188283 .34
DISCCART 650125.764188283 .34
DISCCART 650225.764188283 .34
DISCCART 650325.764188283 .34
DISCCART 650425.764188283 .34
DISCCART 650525.764188283 .34
DISCCART 650625.764188283 .34
DISCCART 650725.764188283 .34
DISCCART 650825.764188283 .34
DISCCART 651125.764188283 .34
DISCCART 649125.764188333 .34
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649825.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649925.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650025.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650125.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650225.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650325.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188333.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649825.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649925.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650025.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650125.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650225.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650325.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188383.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649825.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649925.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650025.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650125.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650225.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650325.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188433.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188483.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188533.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188583.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649825.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649925.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650025.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650125.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650225.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650325.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188633.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649825.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649925.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650025.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650125.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650225.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650325.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188683.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649825.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649925.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650025.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650125.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650225.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650325.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188733.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649825.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649925.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650025.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650125.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650225.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650325.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188783.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649825.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649925.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650025.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650125.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650225.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650325.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650425.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650525.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650625.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650725.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650825.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 651125.76 & 4188833.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649125.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649225.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649325.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649425.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649525.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649625.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649725.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649825.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 649925.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline DISCCART & 650025.76 & 4188883.34 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

    DISCCART 650125.76 4188883.34
    DISCCART 650225.76 4188883.34
    DISCCART 650325.76 4188883.34
    DISCCART 650425.76 4188883.34
    DISCCART 650525.76 4188883.34
    DISCCART 650625.76 4188883.34
    DISCCART 650725.76 4188883.34
    DISCCART 650825.76 4188883.34
    DISCCART 651125.76 4188883.34
    DISCCART 650125.76 4188933.34
    DISCCART 650225.76 4188933.34
    DISCCART 650325.76 4188933.34
    DISCCART 650425.76 4188933.34
    DISCCART 650525.76 4188933.34
    DISCCART 650625.76 4188933.34
    DISCCART 650725.76 4188933.34
    DISCCART 650825.76 4188933.34
    DISCCART 651125.76 4188933.34
    DISCCART 650425.76 4188983.34
    DISCCART 650525.76 4188983.34
    DISCCART 650625.76 4188983.34
    DISCCART 650725.76 4188983.34
    DISCCART 650825.76 4188983.34
    DISCCART 651125.76 4188983.34
    DISCCART 650525.76 4189033.34
    DISCCART 650625.76 4189033.34
    DISCCART 650725.76 4189033.34
    DISCCART 650825.76 4189033.34
    DISCCART 651125.76 4189033.34
    DISCCART 650525.76 4189083.34
    DISCCART 650625.76 4189083.34
    DISCCART 650725.76 4189083.34
    DISCCART 650825.76 4189083.34
    DISCCART 651125.76 4189083.34
    DISCCART 650525.76 4189133.34
    DISCCART 650625.76 4189133.34
    DISCCART 650725.76 4189133.34
    DISCCART 650825.76 4189133.34
    DISCCART 651125.76 4189133.34
    ** DESCRREC "" ""
DISCCART 650781.98 4189510.65
DISCCART 650760.33 4189397.50
RE FINISHED
**
** AERMOD Meteorology Pathway
****************************************
**
**
ME STARTING

```
```

    SURFFILE AERMET\Stockton_2013-2017.SFC
    PROFFILE AERMET\Stockton_2013-2017.PFL
    SURFDATA 23237 2013 Stockton_International_Airport
    UAIRDATA 23230 2013 OAKLAND/WSO_AP
    PROFBASE 10.06 METERS
    ME FINISHED
**
******************************************
** AERMOD Output Pathway
****************************************
**
**
OU STARTING
RECTABLE ALLAVE 1ST
RECTABLE 1 1ST
** Auto-Generated Plotfiles
PLOTFILE 1 VOL1 1ST "Ashley Warehouse.AD\01H1G001.PLT" 31
PLOTFILE 1 VOL2 1ST "Ashley Warehouse.AD\01H1G002.PLT" }3
PLOTFILE 1 VOL3 1ST "Ashley Warehouse.AD\01H1G003.PLT" }3
PLOTFILE 1 VOL4 1ST "Ashley Warehouse.AD\01H1G004.PLT" 34
PLOTFILE 1 VOL5 1ST "Ashley Warehouse.AD\01H1G005.PLT" 35
PLOTFILE 1 VOL6 1ST "Ashley Warehouse.AD\01H1G006.PLT" 36
PLOTFILE PERIOD VOL1 "Ashley Warehouse.AD\PE00G001.PLT" 37
PLOTFILE PERIOD VOL2 "Ashley Warehouse.AD\PE00G002.PLT" }3
PLOTFILE PERIOD VOL3 "Ashley Warehouse.AD\PE00G003.PLT" }3
PLOTFILE PERIOD VOL4 "Ashley Warehouse.AD\PE00G004.PLT" 40
PLOTFILE PERIOD VOL5 "Ashley Warehouse.AD\PE00G005.PLT" 41
PLOTFILE PERIOD VOL6 "Ashley Warehouse.AD\PE00G006.PLT" }4
SUMMFILE "Ashley Warehouse.sum"
OU FINISHED
*** Message Summary For AERMOD Model Setup ***
Summary of Total Messages --------

| A Total of | 0 Fatal Error Message $(s)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| A Total of | 8 Warning Message (s) |
| A Total of | 0 Informational Message(s) |

    ******** FATAL ERROR MESSAGES ********
        *** NONE ***
    ********* WARNING MESSAGES ********
    SO W320 VPARM: Input Parameter May Be Out-of-Range for Parameter
SZINIT
SO W320 49
SZINIT

```
```

SO W320 50 VPARM: Input Parameter May Be Out-of-Range for Parameter
SZINIT
SO W320 51
SZINIT
SO W320 52
SZINIT
SO W320 53
SZINIT
ME W186 454
0.50
ME W187 454
*************************************
SETUP Finishes Successfully
***********************************
N *** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
*** AERMET - VERSION 18081 *** ***
16:20:52
PAGE 1
*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** MODEL SETUP OPTIONS SUMMARY
**Model Is Setup For Calculation of Average CONCentration Values.
-- DEPOSITION LOGIC
**NO GAS DEPOSITION Data Provided.
**NO PARTICLE DEPOSITION Data Provided.
**Model Uses NO DRY DEPLETION. DRYDPLT = F
**Model Uses NO WET DEPLETION. WETDPLT = F
**Model Uses RURAL Dispersion Only.
**Model Allows User-Specified Options:
1. Stack-tip Downwash.
2. Model Assumes Receptors on FLAT Terrain.
3. Use Calms Processing Routine.
4. Use Missing Data Processing Routine.
5. No Exponential Decay.
**Other Options Specified:
ADJ_U* - Use ADJ_U* option for SBL in AERMET
CCVR_Sub - Meteorological data includes CCVR substitutions

```

TEMP_Sub - Meteorological data includes TEMP substitutions
**Model Assumes No FLAGPOLE Receptor Heights.
**The User Specified a Pollutant Type of: OTHER
**Model Calculates 1 Short Term Average(s) of: 1-HR and Calculates PERIOD Averages

**Model Set To Continue RUNning After the Setup Testing.
**The AERMET Input Meteorological Data Version Date: 18081
**Output Options Selected:
Model Outputs Tables of PERIOD Averages by Receptor
Model Outputs Tables of Highest Short Term Values by Receptor (RECTABLE
Keyword)
Model Outputs External File(s) of High Values for Plotting (PLOTFILE
Keyword)
Model Outputs Separate Summary File of High Ranked Values (SUMMFILE Keyword)
**NOTE: The Following Flags May Appear Following CONC Values: c for Calm Hours
\(m\) for Missing
Hours
b for Both Calm
and Missing Hours
\({ }^{* *}\) Misc. Inputs: Base Elev. for Pot. Temp. Profile (m MSL) \(=10.06\); Decay
Coef. \(=0.000\); Rot. Angle \(=0.0\)
Emission Units = GRAMS/SEC
Emission Rate Unit Factor \(=0.10000 \mathrm{E}+07\)
Output Units = MICROGRAMS \(/\) M** \(^{*}\)
**Approximate Storage Requirements of Model \(=\quad 3.6\) MB of RAM.
**Input Runstream File: aermod.inp


*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTORS ***
(X-COORD, Y-COORD, ZELEV, ZHILL, ZFLAG)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ( 649676.3, 4188314.5, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 649629.7, \\
\hline 4188294.8, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 649810.2, 4188312.5, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 649364.1, \\
\hline 4188360.2, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 649327.8, 4188355.0, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 649380.7, \\
\hline 4188758.5, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650495.8, 4188841.5, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650597.5, \\
\hline 4188832.2, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650536.3, 4188878.8, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650577.8, \\
\hline 4188877.8, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650602.7, 4188860.2, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650611.0, \\
\hline 4188880.9, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650638.1, 4188858.5, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650664.1, \\
\hline 4188331.0, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650668.7, 4188350.8, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650678.0, \\
\hline 4188379.9, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650699.7, 4188414.8, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650758.5, \\
\hline 4188658.4, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650765.7, 4188678.8, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650773.7, \\
\hline 4188706.5, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650778.3, 4188726.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650805.3, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


PAGE 5
*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTORS *** (X-COORD, Y-COORD, ZELEV, ZHILL, ZFLAG) (METERS)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ( 649125.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 649225.8, \\
\hline 4188233.3, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 649325.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 649425.8, \\
\hline 4188233.3, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 649525.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 649625.8, \\
\hline 4188233.3, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 649725.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 649825.8, \\
\hline 4188233.3, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 649925.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650025.8, \\
\hline 4188233.3, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650125.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650225.8, \\
\hline 4188233.3, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650325.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650425.8, \\
\hline 4188233.3, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650525.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650625.8, \\
\hline 4188233.3, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 650725.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 650825.8, \\
\hline 4188233.3, 10.1, 10.1, & & 0.0); & & \\
\hline ( 651125.8, 4188233.3, & 10.1, & 10.1, & 0.0); & ( 649125.8, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

```

4188383.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650425.8, 4188383.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); ( 650525.8,
4188383.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650625.8, 4188383.3, 10.1, 10.1
4188383.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650825.8, 4188383.3, 10.1, 10.1
4188383.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(649125.8, 4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1
4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(649325.8, 4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1
4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(649525.8, 4188433.3, 10.1,
4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(649725.8, 4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1
4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(649925.8, 4188433.3, 10.1,
4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650125.8, 4188433.3, 10.1,
4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650325.8, 4188433.3, 10.1,
4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
^ *** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
*** AERMET - VERSION 18081
16:20:52
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MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTORS ***
(METERS)
(650525.8, 4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); ( 650625.8,
4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650725.8, 4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); ( 650825.8,
4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(651125.8, 4188433.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); ( 649125.8,
4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(649225.8, 4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (649325.8,
4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(649425.8, 4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (649525.8,
4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(649625.8, 4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (649725.8,
4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650425.8, 4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (650525.8,
4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0)
(650625.8, 4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); ( 650725.8,
4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0)
(650825.8, 4188483.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (651125.8,

```
4188483.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1, \quad 0.0)\);
( 649125.8, 4188533.3, 10.1, 10.1, 4188533.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0\);
( 649325.8, 4188533.3, 10.1, 10.1, 4188533.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0\); ( \(649525.8,4188533.3,10.1,10.1\), 4188533.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0\); ( \(649725.8,4188533.3,10.1,10.1\), 4188533.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0\); ( \(650525.8,4188533.3,10.1,10.1\), 4188533.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0\); ( 650725.8, 4188533.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188533.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1, \quad 0.0)\); ( \(651125.8,4188533.3,10.1,10.1\) 4188583.3, 10.1, \(10.1, \quad 0.0)\); ( 649225.8, 4188583.3, 10.1, 10.1 , 4188583.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0)\);
( 649425.8, 4188583.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188583.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0)\);
( \(649625.8,4188583.3,10.1,10.1\) 4188583.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650425.8, 4188583.3, \(10.1,0.10 .1\)
4188583.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0\);
\((650625.8,4188583.3,10.10 .1,0.10 .1\)
4188583.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0\);
( \(650825.8,4188583.3,10.10 .1,0.10 .1\)
4188583.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0)\);
( 649125.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1,
4188633.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1, \quad 0.0\) )
( 649325.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188633.3, \(10.1,10.1,10.0\);
( 649525.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188633.3, \(10.1, \quad 10.1,10.0)\);
( 649725.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188633.3, 10.1, \(10.1,10.0)\);
( 649925.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0 ;
( 650125.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650325.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188633.3, \(10.1,10.1,10.0)\);
( 650525.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650725.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188633.3, \(10.1,10.1,10.0)\);
( 651125.8, 4188633.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188683.3, \(10.1,10.1,10.0)\);
( 649225.8, 4188683.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188683.3, \(10.1,10.1,10.0)\); ( 649425.8, 4188683.3, 10.1, 10.1,

4188783.3, 10.1, \(10.1, \quad 0.0)\);
( 649625.8, 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 649825.8, 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650025.8, 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650225.8, 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650425.8, 4188783.3, 10.1, 10 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650625.8, 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650825.8, 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188783.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 649125.8, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10. 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
\((649325.8,4188833.3,10.1,10.1\) 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 649525.8, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 649725.8, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1,
0.0);
( 649925.8, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650125.8, 4188833.3, 10.1,
10.1, 10.1, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1,
0.0);
(650325.8, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1,
10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650525.8, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1, 4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1,
( 650725.8, 4188833.3, 10.1,
0.0);
4188833.3, 10.1, 10.1,
( 651125.8, 4188833.3, 10.1,
0.0);
4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1,
( 649225.8, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1,
4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1,
( 649425.8, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1,
4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 649625.8, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1,
4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 649825.8, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650025.8, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650225.8, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1,
4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650425.8, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1,
4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
( 650625.8, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1,
```

4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650825.8, 4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); ( 651125.8,
4188883.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650125.8, 4188933.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (650225.8,
4188933.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650325.8,4188933.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); ( 650425.8,
4188933.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650525.8,4188933.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (650625.8,
4188933.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650725.8, 4188933.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); ( 650825.8,
4188933.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(651125.8,4188933.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (650425.8,
4188983.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650525.8, 4188983.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (650625.8,
4188983.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650725.8, 4188983.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (650825.8,
4188983.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(651125.8,4188983.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (650525.8,
4189033.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650625.8,4189033.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (650725.8,
4189033.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
(650825.8,4189033.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); (651125.8,
4189033.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0)
(650525.8, 4189083.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0); ( 650625.8,
4189083.3, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
^ *** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
*** AERMET - VERSION 18081 *** ***

```
                                    16:20:52
                                    PAGE 8
    *** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTORS ***
                                    (X-COORD, Y-COORD, ZELEV, ZHILL, ZFLAG)
                                    (METERS)
    ( 650725.8, 4189083.3,
4189083.3, 10.1, 10.1,
10.1, 10.1,
10.1,
0.0);
(650825.8,
4189083.3, 10.1, 10.1,
10.1, 10.1,
0.0); (650525.8,
( 651125.8, 4189083.3,
4189133.3, 10.1, 10.1,
10.1, 10.1,
0.0); (650725.8,
\(\begin{gathered}(650625.8,4189133.3, \\ 4189133.3,\end{gathered} 10.1,10.1\),
10.1, 10.1,
0.0); (651125.8,
4189133.3, 10.1, 10.1,
0.0);
( 650782. \(0,4189510.6,10.1,10.1\)
0.0); (650760.3,
4189397.5, 10.1, 10.1, 0.0);
^ *** AERMOD - VERSION \(19191^{* * *}\) *** C: \Users \Smith \(\backslash\) Dropbox \(\backslash M y\) PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU) \Documents \HRA\Ashley \(* * *\) 10/26/23
*** AERMET - VERSION 18081
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{***} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{16:20:52} \\
\hline *** MODELOPTs: & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{PAGE 9} \\
\hline & * SOURC & CE-REC & PTOR & OMBINATI & IONS FOR WH & IICH CALCULATI \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{BE PERFORMED *} \\
\hline FASTAREA/FASTALL & \multicolumn{6}{|r|}{LESS THAN 1.0 METER; WITHIN OPENPIT; OR BEYOND 8} \\
\hline & & SOURC & E & - - & - RECEPTOR & LOCATION - - \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{DISTANCE} \\
\hline & & ID & & & (METERS) & YR (METERS) \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{(METERS) \({ }^{\text {a }}\) ( \({ }^{\text {a }}\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{- - -} \\
\hline & & VOL1 & & & 650425.8 & 4188383.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline & & VOL1 & & & 650325.8 & 4188433.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-20.36} \\
\hline & & VOL1 & & & 650425.8 & 4188433.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-28.62} \\
\hline & & VOL1 & & & 650425.8 & 4188483.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-15.85} \\
\hline & & VOL2 & & & 649725.8 & 4188383.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-2.18} \\
\hline & & VOL 2 & & & 649825.8 & 4188383.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-14.01} \\
\hline & & VOL2 & & & 649725.8 & 4188433.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-17.56} \\
\hline & & VOL2 & & & 649825.8 & 4188433.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-33.51} \\
\hline & & VOL3 & & & 649725.8 & 4188583.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-1.49} \\
\hline & & VOL3 & & & 649725.8 & 4188633.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-18.28 4188633} \\
\hline & & VOL3 & & & 649825.8 & 4188633.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-34.28 4188633.3} \\
\hline & & VOL3 & & & 649825.8 & 4188683.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-8.99} \\
\hline & & VOL4 & & & 650425.8 & 4188583.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-8.89} \\
\hline & & VOL4 & & & 650325.8 & 4188633.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-24.14} \\
\hline & & VOL4 & & & 650425.8 & 4188633.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{-32.61} \\
\hline & & VOL4 & & & 650325.8 & 4188683.3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

```

                                    1.54, 3.09, 5.14, 8.23,
    10.80,
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** UP TO THE FIRST }24\mathrm{ HOURS OF METEOROLOGICAL
DATA ***
Surface file: AERMET\Stockton_2013-2017.SFC
Met Version: 18081
Profile file: AERMET\Stockton_2013-2017.PFL
Surface format: FREE
Profile format: FREE
Surface station no.: 23237 Upper air station no.: 23230
Name: STOCKTON_INTERNATIONAL_AIRPORT Name:
OAKLAND/WSO_AP
Year: 2013 Year: 2013
First 24 hours of scalar data
YR MO DY JDY HR H0 U* W* DT/DZ ZICNV ZIMCH M-O LEN ZO BOWEN
ALBEDO REF WS WD HT REF TA HT

```

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1301 & 011 & 110 & 61.1 & 0.155 & 0.630 & 0.005 & 150. & 147. & -5.5 & 0.04 & 2.20 \\
\hline 0.27 & 1.60 & 336. & 10.0 & - 277.5 & 52 & 2.0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 111 & 110.2 & 0.238 & 1.137 & 0.005 & 488. & 279. & -11.2 & 0.06 & 2.20 \\
\hline 0.23 & 2.45 & 228. & 10.0 & - 279.9 & & 2.0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 112 & 137.1 & 0.276 & 1.492 & 0.008 & 886. & 347. & -14.0 & 0.08 & 2.20 \\
\hline 0.22 & 2.69 & 286. & 10.0 & - 280.4 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 113 & 141.1 & 0.271 & 1.531 & 0.007 & 929. & 339. & -12.9 & 0.05 & 2.20 \\
\hline 0.21 & 2.88 & 325. & 10.0 & - 282.5 & 52 & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 114 & 121.3 & 0.232 & 1.475 & 0.006 & 965. & 269. & -9.4 & 0.04 & 2.20 \\
\hline 0.22 & 2.57 & 356. & 10.0 & - 283.8 & & 2.0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 115 & 78.7 & 0.218 & 1.287 & 0.005 & 988. & 244. & -12.0 & 0.04 & 2.20 \\
\hline 0.26 & 2.47 & 357. & 10.0 & - 284.2 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 116 & 17.6 & 0.265 & 0.783 & 0.005 & 993. & 327. & -96.0 & 0.03 & 2.20 \\
\hline 0.35 & 3.59 & 2. & 10.0 & - 284.2 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 117 & -11.2 & 0.143 & -9.000 & -9.000 & -999. & 139. & 24.1 & 0.04 & 2.20 \\
\hline 0.60 & 2.16 & 346. & 10.0 & - 282.5 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 118 & -8.7 & 0.125 & -9.000 & -9.000 & -999. & 107. & 20.6 & 0.08 & 2.20 \\
\hline 1.00 & 1.67 & 273. & 10.0 & - 279.2 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 119 & -13.3 & 0.154 & -9.000 & -9.000 & -999. & 145. & 26.0 & 0.06 & 2.20 \\
\hline 1.00 & 2.15 & 238. & 10.0 & - 278.1 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 120 & -10.2 & 0.134 & -9.000 & -9.000 & -999. & 117. & 21.4 & 0.06 & 2.20 \\
\hline 1.00 & 1.89 & 230. & 10.0 & - 275.9 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 121 & -12.5 & 0.148 & -9.000 & -9.000 & -999. & 137. & 24.2 & 0.05 & 2.20 \\
\hline 1.00 & 2.11 & 300. & 10.0 & - 276.4 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & \(122-9\) & -999.0 - & -9.000 & -9.000 & -9.000 & -999. & -999. & -99999.0 & 0.05 & 2.20 \\
\hline 1.00 & 0.00 & 0 . & 10.0 & - 275.9 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 123 & -24.0 & 0.230 & -9.000 & -9.000 & -999. & 264. & 57.9 & 0.04 & 2.20 \\
\hline 1.00 & 3.36 & 80. & 10.0 & - 274.2 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline 1301 & 011 & 124 & -16.1 & 0.169 & -9.000 & -9.000 & -999. & 167. & 31.3 & 0.06 & 2.20 \\
\hline 1.00 & 2.36 & 100. & 10.0 & - 274.2 & & . 0 & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

First hour of profile data YR MO DY HR HEIGHT F WDIR WSPD AMB_TMP sigmaA sigmaW sigmaV \(\begin{array}{llllllllll}13 & 01 & 01 & 01 & 10.0 & 1 & 149 . & 2.78 & 273.8 & 99.0\end{array}\)-99.00 \(\begin{aligned} & -99.00\end{aligned}\)

F indicates top of profile ( \(=1\) ) or below (=0)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*

VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL1
*** THE PERIOD ( 43824 hRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL1
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{** ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3} \\
\hline X-COORD (M) & Y-COORD (M) & CONC & X-COORD (M) \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Y-COORD (M) CONC} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 649676.34 & 4188314.55 & 3.17886 & 649629.66 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188294.842 .81498} \\
\hline 649810.15 & 4188312.48 & 4.33466 & 649364.10 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188360.201 .88281} \\
\hline 649327.80 & 4188355.01 & 1.77280 & 649380.70 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188758.521 .84706} \\
\hline 650495.81 & 4188841.51 & 4.28073 & 650597.47 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188832.17 3.93483} \\
\hline 650536.27 & 4188878.85 & 3.56783 & 650577.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188877.81 3.42873} \\
\hline 650602.66 & 4188860.18 & 3.53924 & 650610.95 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188880.93 3.26850} \\
\hline 650638.10 & 4188858.53 & 3.40358 & 650664.10 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188331.0321 .36195} \\
\hline 650668.72 & 4188350.83 & 21.42188 & 650677.96 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188379.86 20.70636} \\
\hline 650699.74 & 4188414.84 & 18.04783 & 650758.47 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188658.36 5.99965} \\
\hline 650765.73 & 4188678.82 & 5.40633 & 650773.65 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188706.54 4.74863} \\
\hline 650778.27 & 4188726.34 & 4.35960 & 650805.33 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188805.53 3.18808} \\
\hline 650806.65 & 4188824.01 & 3.00930 & 650811.27 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188843.81 2.82339} \\
\hline 650814.57 & 4188862.29 & 2.66944 & 650846.24 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188924.98 2.18464} \\
\hline 650850.86 & 4188951.38 & 2.83971 & 650854.82 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188976.461 .91630} \\
\hline 650698.00 & 4188307.32 & 17.19609 & 650692.60 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188291.80 17.10889} \\
\hline 650724.82 & 4189245.80 & 1.23247 & 650726.07 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189273.371 .17147} \\
\hline 650856.27 & 4189006.30 & 1.78991 & 650857.23 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189022.60 1.72624} \\
\hline 650859.15 & 4189041.29 & 1.65647 & 650859.15 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189058.541 .59875} \\
\hline 650860.58 & 4189076.28 & 1.54084 & 650861.54 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189094.49 1.48561} \\
\hline 650857.71 & 4189113.19 & 1.43818 & 650847.16 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189118.941 .43550} \\
\hline 650848.12 & 4189134.76 & 1.39223 & 650850.04 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}




VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL1

INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL1

\section*{DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS}
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```

4189033.34 2.22350
650625.76 4189033.34
4189033.34 1.91146
650825.76 4189033.34
4189033.34 1.32635
650525.76 4189083.34
4189083.34 1.83687
650725.76 4189083.34
4189083.34 1.56789
651125.76 4189083.34
4189133.34 1.72726
650625.76 4189133.34
4189133.34 1.53412
650825.76 4189133.34
4189133.34 1.12496
650781.98 4189510.65
4189397.50 0.93604

* *** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
*** AERMET - VERSION 18081 *** ***
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** THE PERIOD ( }43824\mathrm{ HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL2
***
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL2
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS

```

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4188880.93 & 1.61532 & & \\
\hline 650638.10 & 10 4188858.53 & 1.64865 & 650664.10 \\
\hline 4188331.03 & 3.11342 & & \\
\hline 650668.72 & 2 4188350.83 & 3.07133 & 650677.96 \\
\hline 4188379.86 & 2.98946 & & \\
\hline 650699.74 & 4188414.84 & 2.82815 & 650758.47 \\
\hline 4188658.36 & 2.01682 & & \\
\hline 650765.73 & 4188678.82 & 1.93522 & 650773.65 \\
\hline 4188706.54 & 1.83426 & & \\
\hline 650778.27 & 4188726.34 & 1.76791 & 650805.33 \\
\hline 4188805.53 & 1.51569 & & \\
\hline 650806.65 & 4188824.01 & 1.47154 & 650811.27 \\
\hline 4188843.81 & 1.42084 & & \\
\hline 650814.57 & 4188862.29 & 1.37651 & 650846.24 \\
\hline 4188924.98 & 1.21324 & & \\
\hline 650850.86 & 4188951.38 & 1.15952 & 650854.82 \\
\hline 4188976.46 & 1.11070 & & \\
\hline 650698.00 & 4188307.32 & 2.92717 & 650692.60 \\
\hline 4188291.80 & 2.96080 & & \\
\hline 650724.82 & 4189245.80 & 0.81555 & 650726.07 \\
\hline 4189273.37 & 0.78752 & & \\
\hline 650856.27 & 4189006.30 & 1.05751 & 650857.23 \\
\hline 4189022.60 & 1.02937 & & \\
\hline 650859.15 & 4189041.29 & 0.99763 & 650859.15 \\
\hline 4189058.54 & 0.97056 & & \\
\hline 650860.58 & 4189076.28 & 0.94297 & 650861.54 \\
\hline 4189094.49 & 0.91620 & & \\
\hline 650857.71 & 4189113.19 & 0.89267 & 650847.16 \\
\hline 4189118.94 & 0.89078 & & \\
\hline 650848.12 & 4189134.76 & 0.86979 & 650850.04 \\
\hline 4189155.37 0. & 0.84357 & & \\
\hline 650851.48 & 4189171.66 & 0.82401 & 650853.87 \\
\hline 4189184.12 & 0.80904 & & \\
\hline 650856.75 & 4189199.46 & 0.79139 & 650857.71 \\
\hline 4189213.36 & 0.77687 & & \\
\hline 650860.58 & 4189226.30 & 0.76291 & 650862.50 \\
\hline 4189242.60 & 0.74685 & & \\
\hline 650865.38 & 4189258.42 & 0.73146 & 650867.77 \\
\hline 4189275.19 0 & 0.71613 & & \\
\hline 650868.73 & 4189291.49 & 0.70246 & 650872.09 \\
\hline 4189309.23 0 & 0.68717 & & \\
\hline 650874.00 & 4189325.04 & 0.67453 & 650875.92 \\
\hline 4189340.38 & 0.66264 & & \\
\hline 650878.80 & 4189355.24 & 0.65106 & 650881.19 \\
\hline 4189373.45 & 0.63776 & & \\
\hline 650884.55 & 4189390.71 & 0.62514 & 650888.86 \\
\hline 4189407.01 & 0.61316 & & \\
\hline 650889.82 & 4189427.14 & 0.60029 & 650891.74 \\
\hline 4189443.43 0 & 0.58973 & & \\
\hline 650895.09 & 4189461.17 & 0.57807 & 650898.45 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4188183.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1.52402} \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188233.34 & 3.19338 & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & 9064 & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188233.34 & 5.14720 & 649425.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & 6.89965 & & \\
\hline 649525.76 & 4188233.34 & 9.62693 & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188233.3414 & 14.54632 & & \\
\hline 649725.76 & 4188233.34 & 23.29348 & 649825.76 \\
\hline 4188233.3429 & 29.10509 & & \\
\hline 649925.76 & 4188233.34 & 27.21619 & 650025.76 \\
\hline 4188233.3420 & 20.01226 & & \\
\hline 650125.76 & 4188233.34 & 13.72709 & 650225.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & 9.55414 & & \\
\hline 650325.76 & 4188233.34 & 6.94719 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & 5.27249 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188233.34 & 4.14569 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & 3.35391 & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188233.34 & 2.77636 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & 2.34159 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188233.34 & 1.52633 & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 & 3.43994 & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188283.34 & 4.36860 & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 & 5.75956 & & \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188283.34 & 7.98535 & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188283.3411 & 11.82794 & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188283.34 & 19.25100 & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 36 & 36.18937 & & \\
\hline 649825.76 & 4188283.34 & 51.39279 & 649925.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 & 40.50726 & & \\
\hline 650025.76 & 4188283.34 & 24.66881 & 650125.76 \\
\hline 4188283.3415 & 15.17722 & & \\
\hline 650225.76 & 4188283.34 & 10.06874 & 650325.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 & 7.16051 & & \\
\hline 650425.76 & 4188283.34 & 5.37023 & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 & 4.19259 & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188283.34 & 3.37591 & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4188283.342 & 2.78511 & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188283.34 & 2.34295 & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188283.341 & 1.51993 & & \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188333.34 & 3.69039 & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188333.34 & 4.75550 & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188333.34 & 6.40890 & 649425.76 \\
\hline 4188333.34 & 9.19867 & & \\
\hline 649525.76 & 4188333.34 & 14.50431 & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188333.3426 & 26.58858 & & \\
\hline 649725.76 & 4188333.34 & 66.40581 & 649825.76 \\
\hline 4188333.34115 & 15.66569 & & \\
\hline 649925.76 & 4188333.34 & 59.35489 & 650025.76 \\
\hline 4188333.3428 & 28.49179 & & \\
\hline 650125.76 & 4188333.34 & 16.07340 & 650225.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{** ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3} \\
\hline X-COORD (M) & Y-COORD (M) & CONC & & X-COORD (M) \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Y-COORD (M) CONC} \\
\hline - - - - - - & - - - - - & - & - - - & - - - - - \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{4188383.34 4.12592} \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188383.34 & 3.31306 & & 650725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{4188383.342 .72904} \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188383.34 & 2.29394 & & 651125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{4188383.341 .48793} \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188433.34 & 4.09850 & & 649225.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4188433.34 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{5.38675} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{649425.76} \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188433.34 & 7.47396 & \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 11.24624 & & \\
\hline 649525.76 & 4188433.34 & 19.37265 & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 43.87140 & & \\
\hline 649725.76 & 4188433.34 & 0.00000 & 649825.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 0.00000 & & \\
\hline 649925.76 & 4188433.34 & 71.42414 & 650025.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 27.95271 & & \\
\hline 650125.76 & 4188433.34 & 15.29271 & 650225.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 9.80085 & & \\
\hline 650325.76 & 4188433.34 & 6.89117 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 5.14954 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188433.34 & 4.01748 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 3.23650 & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188433.34 & 2.67283 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 2.25135 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188433.34 & 1.46661 & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 4.14584 & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188483.34 & 5.43779 & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 7.52052 & & \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188483.34 & 11.24996 & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 1 & 19.10168 & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188483.34 & 41.03794 & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188483.3413 & 30.57562 & & \\
\hline 650425.76 & 4188483.34 & 4.89254 & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 3.85514 & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188483.34 & 3.12782 & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 2.59666 & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188483.34 & 2.19594 & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 1.44144 & & \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188533.34 & 4.06011 & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 5.28197 & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188533.34 & 7.21659 & 649425.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 10.55872 & & \\
\hline 649525.76 & 4188533.34 & 17.07083 & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 32.01676 & & \\
\hline 649725.76 & 4188533.34 & 57.93812 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 4.52709 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188533.34 & 3.62536 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 2.97579 & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188533.34 & 2.49180 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 2.12106 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188533.34 & 1.40944 & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 3.90282 & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188583.34 & 5.02943 & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 6.75592 & & \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188583.34 & 9.56368 & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188583.3414 & 14.53751 & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188583.34 & 23.39309 & 649725.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

4188583.34 28.97272
650425.76 4188583.34 4.08468 650525.76
4188583.34 3.33682
650625.76 4188583.34 2.78027 650725.76
4188583.34 2.35505
650825.76 4188583.34 2.02275 651125.76
4188583.34 1.36769
649125.76 4188633.34 3.72968 649225.76
4188633.34 4.74210
649325.76 4188633.34 6.21997 649425.76
4188633.34 8.48439
649525.76 4188633.34 12.17934 649625.76
4188633.34 16.78164
649725.76 4188633.34 17.00003 649825.76
4188633.34 14.06344
649925.76 4188633.34 11.08611 650025.76
4188633.34 8.54761
650125.76 4188633.34 6.76726 650225.76
4188633.34 5.44856
650325.76 4188633.34 4.42148 650425.76
4188633.34 3.62945
650525.76 4188633.34 3.02478 650625.76
4188633.34 2.55945
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** THE PERIOD ( }43824\mathrm{ HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL2
***
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL2


| 4188683.34 | 5.65015 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 649425.76 | 6 4188683.34 | 7.48381 | 649525.76 |
| 4188683.3410 | 10.10749 |  |  |
| 649625.76 | 6 4188683.34 | 12.07443 | 649725.76 |
| 4188683.3411 | 11.19883 |  |  |
| 649825.76 | 4188683.34 | 9.68918 | 649925.76 |
| 4188683.34 | 8.12036 |  |  |
| 650025.76 | 6 4188683.34 | 6.56786 | 650125.76 |
| 4188683.34 | 5.37382 |  |  |
| 650225.76 | -4188683.34 | 4.49128 | 650325.76 |
| 4188683.34 | 3.78825 |  |  |
| 650425.76 | 4188683.34 | 3.20285 | 650525.76 |
| 4188683.34 | 2.72327 |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 6 4188683.34 | 2.33772 | 650725.76 |
| 4188683.34 | 2.02818 |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 4188683.34 | 1.77717 | 651125.76 |
| 4188683.34 | 1.25469 |  |  |
| 649125.76 | -4188733.34 | 3.32787 | 649225.76 |
| 4188733.34 | 4.07783 |  |  |
| 649325.76 | - 4188733.34 | 5.11491 | 649425.76 |
| 4188733.34 | 6.60710 |  |  |
| 649525.76 | 4188733.34 | 8.27367 | 649625.76 |
| 4188733.34 | 8.87962 |  |  |
| 649725.76 | 4188733.34 | 7.99377 | 649825.76 |
| 4188733.34 | 7.14654 |  |  |
| 649925.76 | 4188733.34 | 6.23314 | 650025.76 |
| 4188733.34 | 5.23947 |  |  |
| 650125.76 | 4188733.34 | 4.39124 | 650225.76 |
| 4188733.34 | 3.73943 |  |  |
| 650325.76 | 4188733.34 | 3.23486 | 650425.76 |
| 4188733.34 | 2.81220 |  |  |
| 650525.76 | 4188733.34 | 2.44422 | 650625.76 |
| 4188733.34 | 2.12996 |  |  |
| 650725.76 | 4188733.34 | 1.86773 | 650825.76 |
| 4188733.34 | 1.65058 |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188733.34 | 1.18916 | 649125.76 |
| 4188783.34 | 3.10612 |  |  |
| 649225.76 | 4188783.34 | 3.75222 | 649325.76 |
| 4188783.34 | 4.64830 |  |  |
| 649425.76 | 4188783.34 | 5.80068 | 649525.76 |
| 4188783.34 | 6.70985 |  |  |
| 649625.76 | 4188783.34 | 6.73588 | 649725.76 |
| 4188783.34 | 6.03619 |  |  |
| 649825.76 | 4188783.34 | 5.52439 | 649925.76 |
| 4188783.34 | 4.95109 |  |  |
| 650025.76 | 4188783.34 | 4.29080 | 650125.76 |
| 4188783.34 | 3.67502 |  |  |
| 650225.76 | 4188783.34 | 3.17341 | 650325.76 |
| 4188783.342 | 2.77768 |  |  |
| 650425.76 | 4188783.34 | 2.46084 | 650525.76 |

```
4188783.34 2.18508
    650625.76 4188783.34 1.93730 650725.76
4188783.34 1.71912
    650825.76 4188783.34 1.53183 651125.76
4188783.34 1.12288
    649125.76 4188833.34 2.89165 649225.76
4188833.34 3.46450
    649325.76 4188833.34 4.23114 649425.76
4188833.34 5.03403
    649525.76 4188833.34 5.44932 649625.76
4188833.34 5.26968
    649725.76 4188833.34 4.74826 649825.76
4188833.34 4.42024
    649925.76 4188833.34 4.03828 650025.76
4188833.34 3.58430
    650125.76 4188833.34 3.12904 650225.76
4188833.34 2.74064
    650325.76 4188833.34 2.41749 650425.76
4188833.34 2.15962
    650525.76 4188833.34 1.94672 650625.76
4188833.34 1.75579
    650725.76 4188833.34 1.58020 650825.76
4188833.34 1.42195
    651125.76 4188833.34 1.05913 649125.76
4188883.34 2.69783
^*** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
    *** AERMET - VERSION 18081 *** ***
                                    16:20:52
                                    PAGE }2
*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL2 ***
                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL2 ,
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
```



| 4188883.34 4.46952 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 649625.76 | 6 4188883.34 | 4.23511 | 649725.76 |
| $4188883.34 \quad 3.85216$ |  |  |  |
| 649825.76 | 6 4188883.34 | 3.63143 | 649925.76 |
| 4188883.34 3.36404 |  |  |  |
| 650025.76 | 4188883.34 | 3.04215 | 650125.76 |
| 4188883.342 .70140 |  |  |  |
| 650225.76 | 4188883.34 | 2.39548 | 650325.76 |
| 4188883.342 .13413 |  |  |  |
| 650425.76 | - 4188883.34 | 1.91367 | 650525.76 |
| 4188883.341 .73655 |  |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 4188883.34 | 1.58591 | 650725.76 |
| 4188883.341 .44763 |  |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 4188883.34 | 1.31819 | 651125.76 |
| 4188883.340 .99972 |  |  |  |
| 650125.76 | 4188933.34 | 2.35936 | 650225.76 |
| 4188933.342 .11301 |  |  |  |
| 650325.76 | 4188933.34 | 1.90294 | 650425.76 |
| 4188933.341 .71586 |  |  |  |
| 650525.76 | 4188933.34 | 1.55983 | 650625.76 |
| 4188933.341 .43284 |  |  |  |
| 650725.76 | 4188933.34 | 1.32186 | 650825.76 |
| 4188933.341 .21810 |  |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188933.34 | 0.94472 | 650425.76 |
| 4188983.341 .55299 |  |  |  |
| 650525.76 | 4188983.34 | 1.41469 | 650625.76 |
| 4188983.341 .30094 |  |  |  |
| 650725.76 | 4188983.34 | 1.20657 | 650825.76 |
| 4188983.341 .12212 |  |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188983.34 | 0.89282 | 650525.76 |
| 4189033.341 .29439 |  |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 4189033.34 | 1.19041 | 650725.76 |
| 4189033.341 .10519 |  |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 4189033.34 | 1.03291 | 651125.76 |
| 4189033.340 .84240 |  |  |  |
| 650525.76 | 4189083.34 | 1.19137 | 650625.76 |
| 4189083.341 .09795 |  |  |  |
| 650725.76 | 4189083.34 | 1.01861 | 650825.76 |
| 4189083.340 .95313 |  |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4189083.34 | 0.79266 | 650525.76 |
| 4189133.34 1.09985 |  |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 4189133.34 | 1.01898 | 650725.76 |
| 4189133.340 .94536 |  |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 4189133.34 | 0.88383 | 651125.76 |
| 4189133.340 .74394 |  |  |  |
| 650781.98 | 4189510.65 | 0.57575 | 650760.33 |
| 4189397.500 .66456 |  |  |  |
| ^ *** AERMOD - VERS | RSION 19191 *** *** | C: UUsers |  |
| (DESKTOP-977GSBU) \D | Documents \HRA\Ashley | *** |  |
| *** AERMET - VERSI | ION 18081 *** *** |  |  |



| 4189273.37 | 1.03794 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 650856.27 | 74189006.30 | 1.43650 | 650857.23 |
| 4189022.60 | 1.40172 |  |  |
| 650859.15 | 5 4189041.29 | 1.36179 | 650859.15 |
| 4189058.54 | 1.32828 |  |  |
| 650860.58 | 4189076.28 | 1.29264 | 650861.54 |
| 4189094.49 | 1.25736 |  |  |
| 650857.71 | 4189113.19 | 1.22695 | 650847.16 |
| 4189118.94 | 1.22756 |  |  |
| 650848.12 | 4189134.76 | 1.19677 | 650850.04 |
| 4189155.37 | 1.15671 |  |  |
| 650851.48 | 4189171.66 | 1.12578 | 650853.87 |
| 4189184.12 | 1.10152 |  |  |
| 650856.75 | 4189199.46 | 1.07242 | 650857.71 |
| 4189213.36 | 1.04795 |  |  |
| 650860.58 | 4189226.30 | 1.02434 | 650862.50 |
| 4189242.60 | 0.99665 |  |  |
| 650865.38 | 4189258.42 | 0.97008 | 650867.77 |
| 4189275.19 | 0.94340 |  |  |
| 650868.73 | 4189291.49 | 0.91931 | 650872.09 |
| 4189309.23 | 0.89297 |  |  |
| 650874.00 | 4189325.04 | 0.87114 | 650875.92 |
| 4189340.38 | 0.85085 |  |  |
| 650878.80 | 4189355.24 | 0.83152 | 650881.19 |
| 4189373.45 | 0.80952 |  |  |
| 650884.55 | 4189390.71 | 0.78921 | 650888.86 |
| 4189407.01 | 0.77042 |  |  |
| 650889.82 | 4189427.14 | 0.75039 | 650891.74 |
| 4189443.43 | 0.73450 |  |  |
| 650895.09 | 4189461.17 | 0.71745 | 650898.45 |
| 4189475.55 | 0.70394 |  |  |
| 650898.45 | 4189489.93 | 0.69236 | 650902.28 |
| 4189504.31 | 0.67960 |  |  |
| 650709.41 | 4188344.56 | 2.78784 | 650722.45 |
| 4188284.032 | 2.65860 |  |  |
| 650745.73 | 4188280.30 | 2.55403 | 650735.49 |
| 4188223.50 | 2.52499 |  |  |
| 650721.52 | 4188167.62 | 2.49239 | 650525.76 |
| 4188133.34 | 3.22934 |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188133.34 | 1.43944 | 649125.76 |
| 4188183.342 | 2.15334 |  |  |
| 649225.76 | 4188183.34 | 2.48010 | 649325.76 |
| 4188183.342 | 2.89100 |  |  |
| 649425.76 | 4188183.34 | 3.48684 | 649525.76 |
| 4188183.34 | 4.40262 |  |  |
| 649625.76 | 4188183.34 | 5.53061 | 649725.76 |
| 4188183.34 | 6.08776 |  |  |
| 649825.76 | 4188183.34 | 6.32118 | 649925.76 |
| 4188183.34 | 6.82259 |  |  |
| ^ *** AERMOD - VERS | SION 19191 *** | C: UUsers |  |



| 4188283.34 | 2.52179 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 649225.76 | 6 4188283.34 | 3.01585 | 649325.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 3.62624 |  |  |
| 649425.76 | 6 4188283.34 | 4.42566 | 649525.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 5.68923 |  |  |
| 649625.76 | 6 4188283.34 | 7.70406 | 649725.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 9.30317 |  |  |
| 649825.76 | 6 4188283.34 | 9.98479 | 649925.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 10.63775 |  |  |
| 650025.76 | 6 4188283.34 | 9.73193 | 650125.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 8.46513 |  |  |
| 650225.76 | 4188283.34 | 7.06798 | 650325.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 5.74576 |  |  |
| 650425.76 | 6 4188283.34 | 4.65065 | 650525.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 3.79721 |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 6 4188283.34 | 3.14450 | 650725.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 2.64313 |  |  |
| 650825.76 | -4188283.34 | 2.25306 | 651125.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 1.49799 |  |  |
| 649125.76 | 6 4188333.34 | 2.72119 | 649225.76 |
| 4188333.34 | 3.30781 |  |  |
| 649325.76 | 6 4188333.34 | 4.08164 | 649425.76 |
| 4188333.34 | 5.09378 |  |  |
| 649525.76 | ¢ 4188333.34 | 6.61190 | 649625.76 |
| 4188333.34 | 9.27628 |  |  |
| 649725.76 | 4188333.34 | 12.01002 | 649825.76 |
| 4188333.34 | 13. 27410 |  |  |
| 649925.76 | - 4188333.34 | 13.86341 | 650025.76 |
| 4188333.34 | 12.20215 |  |  |
| 650125.76 | - 4188333.34 | 10.09155 | 650225.76 |
| 4188333.34 | 7.96944 |  |  |
| 650325.76 | 4 4188333.34 | 6.21641 | 650425.76 |
| 4188333.34 | 4.90067 |  |  |
| 650525.76 | 4188333.34 | 3.93887 | 650625.76 |
| 4188333.34 | 3.23043 |  |  |
| 650725.76 | 4188333.34 | 2.69860 | 650825.76 |
| 4188333.34 | 2.29105 |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188333.34 | 1.51342 | 649125.76 |
| 4188383.34 | 2.94317 |  |  |
| 649225.76 | -4188383.34 | 3.62377 | 649325.76 |
| 4188383.34 | 4.57719 |  |  |
| 649425.76 | 4188383.34 | 5.91204 | 649525.76 |
| 4188383.34 | 7.85905 |  |  |
| 649625.76 | 4188383.34 | 11.38792 | 649725.76 |
| 4188383.3416 | 6.14259 |  |  |
| 649825.76 | 4188383.34 | 18.67285 | 649925.76 |
| 4188383.34 | 8.80664 |  |  |
| 650025.76 | 4188383.34 | 15.56022 | 650125.76 |
| 4188383.34 | 1.89170 |  |  |
| 650225.76 | 4188383.34 | 8.81638 | 650325.76 |



| 4188483.34 | 5.73416 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 649425.76 | 64188483.34 | 7.93948 | 649525.76 |
| 4188483.34 | 11.73148 |  |  |
| 649625.76 | 64188483.34 | 19.02810 | 649725.76 |
| 4188483.34 | 35.49091 |  |  |
| 650425.76 | 64188483.34 | 5.36777 | 650525.76 |
| 4188483.34 | 4.19167 |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 64188483.34 | 3.37570 | 650725.76 |
| 4188483.34 | 2.78525 |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 64188483.34 | 2.34326 | 651125.76 |
| 4188483.34 | 1.52035 |  |  |
| 649125.76 | 64188533.34 | 3.68035 | 649225.76 |
| 4188533.34 | 4.74001 |  |  |
| 649325.76 | 64188533.34 | 6.38280 | 649425.76 |
| 4188533.34 | 9.14908 |  |  |
| 649525.76 | 6 4188533.34 | 14.39134 | 649625.76 |
| 4188533.34 | 26.24989 |  |  |
| 649725.76 | 64188533.34 | 64.67384 | 650425.76 |
| 4188533.34 | 5.38754 |  |  |
| 650525.76 | $6 \quad 4188533.34$ | 4.18790 | 650625.76 |
| 4188533.34 | 3.36287 |  |  |
| 650725.76 | 6 4188533.34 | 2.76929 | 650825.76 |
| 4188533.34 | 2.32678 |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 64188533.34 | 1.50693 | 649125.76 |
| 4188583.34 | 3.91863 |  |  |
| 649225.76 | 6 4188583.34 | 5.11108 | 649325.76 |
| 4188583.34 | 7.01342 |  |  |
| 649425.76 | 6 4188583.34 | 10.36891 | 649525.76 |
| 4188583.34 | 17.28721 |  |  |
| 649625.76 | 6 4188583.34 | 36.17104 | 649725.76 |
| 4188583.34 | 0.00000 |  |  |
| 650425.76 | 6 4188583.34 | 5.31588 | 650525.76 |
| 4188583.34 | 4.12942 |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 6 4188583.34 | 3.31565 | 650725.76 |
| 4188583.34 | 2.73102 |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 6 4188583.34 | 2.29549 | 651125.76 |
| 4188583.34 | 1.48875 |  |  |
| 649125.76 | 6 4188633.34 | 4.09341 | 649225.76 |
| 4188633.34 | 5.37934 |  |  |
| 649325.76 | 6 4188633.34 | 7.46234 | 649425.76 |
| 4188633.34 | 11.22592 |  |  |
| 649525.76 | 4188633.34 | 19.33046 | 649625.76 |
| 4188633.34 | 43.76064 |  |  |
| 649725.76 | -4188633.34 | 0.00000 | 649825.76 |
| 4188633.34 | 0.00000 |  |  |
| 649925.76 | . 4188633.34 | 72.15382 | 650025.76 |
| 4188633.34 | 28.10931 |  |  |
| 650125.76 | 4188633.34 | 15.34833 | 650225.76 |
| 4188633.34 | 9.82653 |  |  |
| 650325.76 | -4188633.34 | 6.98505 | 650425.76 |


$4188733.34 \quad 10.59555$
649525.764188733 .34
$4188733.34 \quad 32.41030$
649725.764188733 .34
$4188733.34 \quad 49.40382$
649925.764188733 .34
$4188733.34 \quad 16.78089$
650125.764188733 .34
$4188733.34 \quad 7.87122$
$650325.76 \quad 4188733.34$
$4188733.34 \quad 4.54380$
650525.764188733 .34
$4188733.34 \quad 2.98283$
$650725.76 \quad 4188733.34$
$4188733.34 \quad 2.12453$
$651125.76 \quad 4188733.34$
$4188783.34 \quad 3.90989$
649225.764188783 .34
$4188783.34 \quad 6.77669$
649425.764188783 .34
$4188783.34 \quad 14.64257$
$649625.76 \quad 4188783.34$
$4188783.34 \quad 29.72837$
649825.764188783 .34
$4188783.34 \quad 16.57483$
650025.764188783 .34
$4188783.34 \quad 8.76742$
$650225.76 \quad 4188783.34$
$4188783.34 \quad 5.14843$
$650425.76 \quad 4188783.34$
$4188783.34 \quad 3.34933$
650625.764188783 .34
$4188783.34 \quad 2.36113$
$650825.76 \quad 4188783.34$
4188783 . 341.36958
649125.764188833 .34
$4188833.34 \quad 4.75463$
649325.764188833 .34
4188833.348 .52876
$649525.76 \quad 4188833.34$
$4188833.34 \quad 17.01050$
649725.764188833 .34
4188833.3414 .31624 $649925.76 \quad 4188833.34$
$4188833.34 \quad 8.65267$
$650125.76 \quad 4188833.34$
$4188833.34 \quad 5.49234$
$650325.76 \quad 4188833.34$
$4188833.34 \quad 3.64779$
$650525.76 \quad 4188833.34$
17.17317
649625.76
59.89342
649825.76
27.36027
650025.76
11.13567
650225.76
5.86018
650425.76
$3.63595 \quad 650625.76$
$2.49666 \quad 650825.76$
$1.41090 \quad 649125.76$
$5.04074 \quad 649325.76$
$9.60791 \quad 649525.76$
$23.70639 \quad 649725.76$
$23.40091 \quad 649925.76$
$11.85647 \quad 650125.76$
$6.63364 \quad 650325.76$
$4.10349 \quad 650525.76$
$2.78888 \quad 650725.76$
$2.02716 \quad 651125.76$
$3.73707 \quad 649225.76$
$6.24316 \quad 649425.76$
$12.27054 \quad 649625.76$
$17.34295 \quad 649825.76$
$11.24801 \quad 650025.76$
$6.83665 \quad 650225.76$
$4.44911 \quad 650425.76$
3.03758

```
4188833.34 2.56867
    650725.76 4188833.34 2.20197 650825.76
4188833.34 1.90988
    651125.76 4188833.34 1.31774 649125.76
4188883.34
    3.54824
**** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
    *** AERMET - VERSION 18081
                                    *** 16:20:52
                                    PAGE 26
    *** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL3
***
                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL3
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
***
                                    ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
    X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M) CONC
```



```
    649225.76 4188883.34 4.43287 649325.76
4188883.34 5.67357
    649425.76 4188883.34
    7.52288
    649525.76
4188883.34 10.18654
    649625.76 4188883.34
    12.23401
    649725.76
4188883.34 11.37789
    649825.76 4188883.34
    9.82648
    649925.76
4188883.34 8.21815
    650025.76 4188883.34
    6.63533
    650125.76
4188883.34 5.42306
    650225.76 4188883.34
    4.52709
    650325.76
4188883.34 3.81289
    650425.76 4188883.34
    3.21970 650525.76
4188883.34 2.73526
    650625.76 4188883.34
    2.34664 650725.76
4188883.34 2.03499
    650825.76 4188883.34 1.78245 651125.76
4188883.34 1.25728
    650125.76 4188933.34 4.42613 650225.76
4188933.34 3.76685
    650325.76 4188933.34 3.25597 650425.76
4188933.34 2.82754
    650525.76 4188933.34 2.45527 650625.76
```

```
4188933.34 2.13819
    650725.76 4188933.34
4188933.34 1.65567
    651125.76 4188933.34
4188983.34 2.47443
    650525.76 4188983.34
4188983.34 1.94496
    650725.76 4188983.34
4188983.34 1.53654
        651125.76 4188983.34
4189033.34 1.95603
        650625.76 4189033.34
4189033.34 1.58575
        650825.76 4189033.34
4189033.34 1.06167
        650525.76 4189083.34
4189083.34 1.59260
        650725.76 4189083.34
4189083.34 1.32236
        651125.76 4189083.34
4189133.34 1.56651
        650625.76 4189133.34
4189133.34 1.32684
        650825.76 4189133.34
4189133.34 0.94691
        650781.98 4189510.65
4189397.50 0.84794
4189397.50 0.84794
^ *** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
    *** AERMET - VERSION 18081
                                    *** 16:20:52
                            PAGE 27
    *** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL4
    1.87412 650825.76
    1.19188 650425.76
    2.19533 650625.76
    1.72501 650825.76
    1.12557 650525.76
    1.76302 650725.76
    1.42632 651125.76
    1.74461 650625.76
    1.45294 650825.76
    1.00208 650525.76
    1.43876 650725.76
    1.22213 651125.76
    0.72839 650760.33
                                *** THE PERIOD ( }43824\mathrm{ HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL4 ,
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
***
                                    ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
    X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M)
    CONC
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4188294.84 & 2.17745 & & \\
\hline 649810.15 & 4 4188312.48 & 3.08374 & 649364.10 \\
\hline 4188360.20 & 1.58424 & & \\
\hline 649327.80 & - 4188355.01 & 1.50063 & 649380.70 \\
\hline 4188758.52 & 2.05797 & & \\
\hline 650495.81 & 4188841.51 & 11.80094 & 650597.47 \\
\hline 4188832.17 & 9.58103 & & \\
\hline 650536.27 & 74188878.85 & 8.43238 & 650577.76 \\
\hline 4188877.81 & 7.72942 & & \\
\hline 650602.66 & 4 4188860.18 & 8.03149 & 650610.95 \\
\hline 4188880.93 & 7.06099 & & \\
\hline 650638.10 & 4188858.53 & 7.45981 & 650664.10 \\
\hline 4188331.0310 & 10.99804 & & \\
\hline 650668.72 & 4188350.83 & 11.84652 & 650677.96 \\
\hline 4188379.86 & 13.04295 & & \\
\hline 650699.74 & 4188414.84 & 13.84215 & 650758.47 \\
\hline 4188658.3612 & 12.41463 & & \\
\hline 650765.73 & 4188678.82 & 11.48428 & 650773.65 \\
\hline 4188706.5410 & 10.29609 & & \\
\hline 650778.27 & 4188726.34 & 9.49119 & 650805.33 \\
\hline 4188805.53 & 6.49327 & & \\
\hline 650806.65 & 4188824.01 & 6.01584 & 650811.27 \\
\hline 4188843.81 & 5.50341 & & \\
\hline 650814.57 & 4188862.29 & 5.08128 & 650846.24 \\
\hline 4188924.98 & 3.80750 & & \\
\hline 650850.86 & 4188951.38 & 3.45480 & 650854.82 \\
\hline 4188976.46 & 3.16806 & & \\
\hline 650698.00 & 4188307.32 & 9.43680 & 650692.60 \\
\hline 4188291.80 & 8.96978 & & \\
\hline 650724.82 & 4189245.80 & 1.82127 & 650726.07 \\
\hline 4189273.37 & 1.71057 & & \\
\hline 650856.27 & 4189006.30 & 2.88868 & 650857.23 \\
\hline 4189022.60 & 2.75317 & & \\
\hline 650859.15 & 4189041.29 & 2.60811 & 650859.15 \\
\hline 4189058.54 & 2.49072 & & \\
\hline 650860.58 & 4189076.28 & 2.37467 & 650861.54 \\
\hline 4189094.492 & 2.26554 & & \\
\hline 650857.71 & 4189113.19 & 2.17283 & 650847.16 \\
\hline 4189118.94 & 2.16753 & & \\
\hline 650848.12 & 4189134.76 & 2.08391 & 650850.04 \\
\hline 4189155.37 & 1.98088 & & \\
\hline 650851.48 & 4189171.66 & 1.90515 & 650853.87 \\
\hline 4189184.12 & 1.84794 & & \\
\hline 650856.75 & 4189199.46 & 1.78133 & 650857.71 \\
\hline 4189213.36 & 1.72699 & & \\
\hline 650860.58 & 4189226.30 & 1.67571 & 650862.50 \\
\hline 4189242.60 1 & 1.61710 & & \\
\hline 650865.38 & 4189258.42 & 1.56197 & 650867.77 \\
\hline 4189275.19 1 & 1.50774 & & \\
\hline 650868.73 & 4189291.49 & 1.45969 & 650872.09 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

4189309.23 1.40741
650874.00 4189325.04 1.36458 650875.92
4189340.38 1.32492
650878.80 4189355.24 1.28718 650881.19
4189373.45 1.24431
650884.55 4189390.71 1.20471
4189407.01 1.16812
650889.82 4189427.14
4189443.43 1.09750
650895.09 4189461.17
4189475.55 1.03759
650898.45 4189489.93
4189504.31 0.98947
650709.41 4188344.56
4188284.03 8.33032
650745.73 4188280.30
4188223.50 6.64676
650721.52 4188167.62
4188133.34 5.55336
651125.76 4188133.34
4188183.34 1.01532
649225.76 4188183.34
4188183.34 1.26295
649425.76 4188183.34
4188183.34 1.62822
649625.76 4188183.34
1.86782
649725.76
4188183.34 2.14659
649825.76 4188183.34
4188183.34
2.88008
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** THE PERIOD ( }43824\mathrm{ HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL4
***
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL4 ,
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
***
** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M)
CONC

```
\(650025.76 \quad 4188183.34 \quad 3.47894\)
650125.76
\(4188183.34 \quad 4.39242\)
\(650225.76 \quad 4188183.34\)
5.47962
650325.76
\(4188183.34 \quad 5.97956\)
\(650425.76 \quad 4188183.34\)
6.22010
650525.76
6.48260
650725.76
5.30470
651125.76
1.06038
649225.76
1.32668
649425.76
1.72316
649625.76
2.33019
649825.76
3.21026
650025.76
\(4.96603 \quad 650225.76\)
\(7.29090 \quad 650425.76\)
\(8.23595 \quad 650625.76\)
\(6.94876 \quad 650825.76\)
\(3.58740 \quad 649125.76\)
\(1.23762 \quad 649325.76\)
1.58839
649525.76
2.13096
649725.76
3.00767
649925.76
4.40540
7.64742
9.77586
650525.76
9.48550
650725.76
651125.76
649225.76

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Y-COORD (M) CONC} \\
\hline - - - - - - - & - - - - - - & - - - - & - - - - \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(650425.76 \quad 4188383.34\)} & 18.09982 & 650525.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188383.3418 .12909} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{4188383.34650625 .76} & 64188383.34 & 15.05185 & 650725.76 \\
\hline & 11.57960 & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 64188383.34 & 8.63926 & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188383.34 & 4.01199 & & \\
\hline 649125.76 & 6 4188433.34 & 1.23551 & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 1.40084 & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 64188433.34 & 1.60477 & 649425.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 1.86055 & & \\
\hline 649525.76 & 64188433.34 & 2.18731 & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 2.61358 & & \\
\hline 649725.76 & 64188433.34 & 3.18420 & 649825.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 3.97495 & & \\
\hline 649925.76 & 64188433.34 & 5.11957 & 650025.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 6.83924 & & \\
\hline 650125.76 & 64188433.34 & 9.49084 & 650225.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 14.32207 & & \\
\hline 650325.76 & 6 4188433.34 & 22.35916 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 27.41590 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 64188433.34 & 25.61952 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 19.11096 & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 6 4188433.34 & 13.30238 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 9.34593 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 64188433.34 & 4.10107 & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 1.28195 & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 64188483.34 & 1.45832 & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 1.67704 & & \\
\hline 649425.76 & 64188483.34 & 1.95349 & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 2.31086 & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 6 4188483.34 & 2.78506 & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 3.43414 & & \\
\hline 650425.76 & \(6 \quad 4188483.34\) & 47.22930 & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 37.69430 & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 6 4188483.34 & 23.57916 & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 14.75385 & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 6 4188483.34 & 9.87309 & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 4.15295 & & \\
\hline 649125.76 & 6 4188533.34 & 1.32708 & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 1.51509 & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 6 4188533.34 & 1.74961 & 649425.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 2.04808 & & \\
\hline 649525.76 & 64188533.34 & 2.43727 & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 2.95996 & & \\
\hline 649725.76 & 6 4188533.34 & 3.68812 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34101 & 91. 22201 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188533.34 & 54.95206 & 650625.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline X-COORD (M) & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{COORD (M) CONC} & X-COORD (M) \\
\hline Y-COORD (M) & CONC & & \\
\hline - - - - - & - - - - - & - & - - - - - \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -} \\
\hline 650725.76 & -4188633.34 & 15.18468 & 650825.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188633.34 9.74237} \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188633.34 & 4.00094 & 649125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188683.341 .42486} \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188683.34 & 1.63555 & 649325.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188683.341 .90083} \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188683.34 & 2.24224 & 649525.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188683.342 .69337} \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188683.34 & 3.30932 & 649725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188683.34 4.18607} \\
\hline 649825.76 & 4188683.34 & 5.50429 & 649925.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\(4188683.34 \quad 7.64032\)} \\
\hline 650025.76 & 4188683.34 & 11.49670 & 650125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188683.3419 .74279} \\
\hline 650225.76 & 4188683.34 & 43.67173 & 650325.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188683.340 .00000} \\
\hline 650425.76 & 4188683.34 & 0.00000 & 650525.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188683.34 49.34341} \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188683.34 & 23.03667 & 650725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188683.3413 .52563} \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188683.34 & 8.98400 & 651125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188683.34 3.84918} \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188733.34 & 1.43087 & 649225.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188733.341 .63948} \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188733.34 & 1.90100 & 649425.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188733.34 2.23590} \\
\hline 649525.76 & 4188733.34 & 2.67592 & 649625.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188733.34 3.27286} \\
\hline 649725.76 & 4188733.34 & 4.11604 & 649825.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188733.345 .37069} \\
\hline 649925.76 & 4188733.34 & 7.36967 & 650025.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188733.3410 .86026} \\
\hline 650125.76 & 4188733.34 & 17.79858 & 650225.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188733.34 34.34872} \\
\hline 650325.76 & 4188733.34 & 66.12417 & 650425.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188733.3454 .34743} \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188733.34 & 28.49711 & 650625.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188733.3417 .09461} \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188733.34 & 11.22699 & 650825.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\(4188733.34 \quad 7.89884\)} \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188733.34 & 3.63265 & 649125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188783.341 .41678} \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188783.34 & 1.61783 & 649325.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188783.341 .86870} \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188783.34 & 2.18853 & 649525.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{** ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3} \\
\hline X-COORD (M) & ) Y-COORD (M) & CONC & X-COORD (M) \\
\hline Y-COORD (M) & CONC & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 64188883.34 & 1.5342 & 649325.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188883.34 1.76516} \\
\hline 649425.76 & 64188883.34 & 2.0582 & 649525.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188883.34 2.43636} \\
\hline 649625.76 & - 4188883.34 & 2.93278 & 649725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188883.34 3.59744 64.30} \\
\hline 649825.76 & 64188883.34 & 4.5070 & 649925.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188883.345 .78976} \\
\hline 650025.76 & 6 4188883.34 & 7.71039 & 650125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188883.3410 .49604} \\
\hline 650225.76 & 6 4188883.34 & 12.67149 & 650325.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188883.34 11.77795} \\
\hline 650425.76 & -4188883.34 & 10.1269 & 650525.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188883.34 8.40436} \\
\hline 650625.76 & 6 4188883.34 & 6.75473 & 650725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188883.345 .50983} \\
\hline 650825.76 & - 4188883.34 & 4.58719 & 651125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188883.34 2.74863} \\
\hline 650125.76 & - 4188933.34 & 8.57127 & 650225.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188933.34 9.25470} \\
\hline 650325.76 & - 4188933.34 & 8.32775 & 650425.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188933.34 7.41486} \\
\hline 650525.76 & -4188933.34 & 6.42232 & 650625.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188933.34 5.36791} \\
\hline 650725.76 & - 4188933.34 & 4.48653 & 650825.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188933.34 3.81479} \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188933.34 & 2.46957 & 650425.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188983.34 5.70189} \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188983.34 & 5.08429 & 650625.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188983.34 4.38492 4} \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188983.34 & 3.74530 & 650825.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188983.34 3.22920} \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188983.34 & 2.21069 & 650525.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189033.34 4.13594} \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4189033.34 & 3.65626 & 650725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189033.34 3.18341} \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4189033.34 & 2.78338 & 651125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189033.34 1.97157} \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4189083.34 & 3.43797 & 650625.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189083.34 3.09880} \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4189083.34 & 2.74439 & 650825.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4189083.342 .43021} \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4189083.34 & 1.75870 & 650525.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

4189133.34
2.90857
650625.76 4189133.34 2.66216 650725.76
4189133.34 2.39417
650825.76
2.14178
651125.76
4189133.34 1.57810
650781.98 4189510.65 1.05019
650760.33
4189397.50 1.29773
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL5 ** THE PERIOD ( }43824\mathrm{ HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL5
DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
***
** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M) CONC
- - - -
649676.34 4188314.55
4188294.84 3.71161
649810.15 4188312.48 5.82164 649364.10
4188360.20 2.50416
649327.80 4188355.01
4188758.52 3.54322
650495.81 4188841.51
4188832.17 4.79433
650536.27 4188878.85
4.56629
650577.76
4188877.81 4.26173
650602.66 4188860.18
4.32668 650610.95
4188880.93 3.98057
650638.10 4188858.53 4.06986 650664.10
4188331.03 5.73628
650668.72 4188350.83 5.80497 650677.96
4188379.86 5.83816
650699.74 4188414.84 5.66878 650758.47
4188658.36 4.71195
650765.73 4188678.82 4.53135 650773.65
4188706.54 4.29592
650778.27 4188726.34 4.12926 650805.33

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4188805.53 & 3.37467 & & \\
\hline 650806.65 & 4188824.01 & 3.23931 & 650811.27 \\
\hline 4188843.81 & 3.07996 & & \\
\hline 650814.57 & 4188862.29 & 2.94293 & 650846.24 \\
\hline 4188924.98 & 2.44890 & & \\
\hline 650850.86 & 4188951.38 & 2.29968 & 650854.82 \\
\hline 4188976.46 & 2.16699 & & \\
\hline 650698.00 & 4188307.32 & 5.15181 & 650692.60 \\
\hline 4188291.80 & 5.11272 & & \\
\hline 650724.82 & 4189245.80 & 1.39442 & 650726.07 \\
\hline 4189273.37 & 1.32430 & & \\
\hline 650856.27 & 4189006. 30 & 2.02557 & 650857.23 \\
\hline 4189022.60 & 1.95114 & & \\
\hline 650859.15 & 4189041.29 & 1.86741 & 650859.15 \\
\hline 4189058.54 & 1.79671 & & \\
\hline 650860.58 & 4189076.28 & 1.72495 & 650861.54 \\
\hline 4189094.49 & 1.65607 & & \\
\hline 650857.71 & 4189113.19 & 1.59632 & 650847.16 \\
\hline 4189118.94 & 1.59177 & & \\
\hline 650848.12 & 4189134.76 & 1.53894 & 650850.04 \\
\hline 4189155.37 & 1.47399 & & \\
\hline 650851.48 & 4189171.66 & 1.42637 & 650853.87 \\
\hline 4189184.12 & 1.39037 & & \\
\hline 650856.75 & 4189199.46 & 1.34844 & 650857.71 \\
\hline 4189213.36 & 1.31435 & & \\
\hline 650860.58 & 4189226.30 & 1.28193 & 650862.50 \\
\hline 4189242.60 & 1.24494 & & \\
\hline 650865.38 & 4189258.42 & 1.20986 & 650867.77 \\
\hline 4189275.19 & 1.17520 & & \\
\hline 650868.73 & 4189291.49 & 1.14439 & 650872.09 \\
\hline 4189309.23 & 1.11027 & & \\
\hline 650874.00 & 4189325.04 & 1.08210 & 650875.92 \\
\hline 4189340.38 & 1.05571 & & \\
\hline 650878.80 & 4189355.24 & 1.03023 & 650881.19 \\
\hline 4189373.45 & 1.00097 & & \\
\hline 650884.55 & 4189390.71 & 0.97351 & 650888.86 \\
\hline 4189407.01 & 0.94779 & & \\
\hline 650889.82 & 4189427.14 & 0.91980 & 650891.74 \\
\hline 4189443.43 & 0.89725 & & \\
\hline 650895.09 & 4189461.17 & 0.87285 & 650898.45 \\
\hline 4189475.55 & 0.85343 & & \\
\hline 650898.45 & 4189489.93 & 0.83616 & 650902.28 \\
\hline 4189504.31 & 0.81767 & & \\
\hline 650709.41 & 4188344.56 & 5.22369 & 650722.45 \\
\hline 4188284.03 & 4.75112 & & \\
\hline 650745.73 & 4188280.30 & 4.50699 & 650735.49 \\
\hline 4188223.50 & 4.27643 & & \\
\hline 650721.52 & 4188167.62 & 4.00885 & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4188133.34 & 4.73990 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188133.34 & 2.11985 & 649125.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4188233.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{7.41870} \\
\hline 650125.76 & 4188233.34 & 7.78610 & 650225.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & 8.41687 & & \\
\hline 650325.76 & 4188233.34 & 8.00094 & 650425.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\(4188233.34 \quad 7.15967\)} \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188233.34 & 6.26119 & 650625.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188233.34 5.29761} \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188233.34 & 4.41471 & 650825.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188233.34 3.67317} \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188233.34 & 2.23056 & 649125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188283.341 .57616} \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188283.34 & 1.81183 & 649325.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188283.342 .11092} \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188283.34 & 2.49504 & 649525.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\(4188283.34 \quad 2.98268\)} \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188283.34 & 3.58559 & 649725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188283.34 4.36785} \\
\hline 649825.76 & 4188283.34 & 5.59026 & 649925.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\(4188283.34 \quad 7.57052\)} \\
\hline 650025.76 & 4188283.34 & 9.26521 & 650125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188283.34 9.93059} \\
\hline 650225.76 & 4188283.34 & 10.66180 & 650325.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\(4188283.34 \quad 9.81970\)} \\
\hline 650425.76 & 4188283.34 & 8.55828 & 650525.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188283.347 .16251} \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188283.34 & 5.82669 & 650725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188283.34 4.71437} \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188283.34 & 3.84578 & 651125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188283.342 .27534} \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188333.34 & 1.66505 & 649225.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188333.341 .92604} \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188333.34 & 2.25742 & 649425.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188333.342 .69035} \\
\hline 649525.76 & 4188333.34 & 3.26686 & 649625.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188333.34 4.02874} \\
\hline 649725.76 & 4188333.34 & 5.02306 & 649825.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188333.34 6.49244} \\
\hline 649925.76 & 4188333.34 & 9.07932 & 650025.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188333.3411 .92189} \\
\hline 650125.76 & 4188333.34 & 13.19289 & 650225.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 650325.76 & 4188333.34 & 12.34225 & 650425.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188333.3410 .24134} \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188333.34 & 8.10100 & 650625.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188333.34 6.31693} \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188333.34 & 4.97388 & 650825.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188333.34 3.99215} \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188333.34 & 2.31415 & 649125.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188383.341 .75327} \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188383.34 & 2.04467 & 649325.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

4188383.34 2.41766
649425.76 4188383.34 2.90801 649525.76
4188383.34 3.57512
649625.76 4188383.34 4.50899 649725.76
4188383.34 5.81775
649825.76 4188383.34 7.71025 649925.76
4188383.34 11.10088
650025.76 4188383.34 15.94111 650125.76
4188383.34 18.54924
650225.76 4188383.34 18.98036 650325.76
4188383.34 15.81286
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL5
THE PERIOD ( }43824\mathrm{ HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL5 ,
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
***
** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M) CONC

```
650425.764188383 .34
4188383.348 .98970
\(650625.76 \quad 4188383.34\)
\(4188383.34 \quad 5.18851\)
\(650825.76 \quad 4188383.34\)
\(4188383.34 \quad 2.34573\)
649125.764188433 .34
1.84104
649225.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 2.16261\)
649325.764188433 .34
\(4188433.34 \quad 3.14290\)
649525.764188433 .34
\(4188433.34 \quad 5.03933\)
\(649725.76 \quad 4188433.34\)
\(4188433.34 \quad 9.34625\)
\(649925.76 \quad 13.98607 \quad 650025.76\)
\(4188433.34 \quad 22.45781\)
\(\begin{array}{llll}650125.76 & 4188433.34 & 28.37667 & 650225.76\end{array}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4188433.34 & 27.23361 & & \\
\hline 650325.76 & 64188433.34 & 20.29911 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188433.3413 & 13.99978 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 64188433.34 & 9.74143 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 7.06969 & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & \(6 \quad 4188433.34\) & 5.35474 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 4.20308 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 64188433.34 & 2.36549 & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 1.93189 & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 64188483.34 & 2.28276 & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 2.74766 & & \\
\hline 649425.76 & \(6 \quad 4188483.34\) & 3.38316 & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 4.28538 & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 64188483.34 & 5.63018 & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 7.76831 & & \\
\hline 650425.76 & 64188483.34 & 15.57303 & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 10.29625 & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 64188483.34 & 7.29871 & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 5.45978 & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 64188483.34 & 4.25389 & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 2.36788 & & \\
\hline 649125.76 & 64188533.34 & 2.02377 & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 2.40540 & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 64188533.34 & 2.91678 & 649425.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 3.62731 & & \\
\hline 649525.76 & 64188533.34 & 4.66079 & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 6.25618 & & \\
\hline 649725.76 & \(6 \quad 4188533.34\) & 8.92667 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188533.3416 & 16.57399 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 64188533.34 & 10.58387 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 7.38710 & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 64188533.34 & 5.48145 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 4.25072 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 64188533.34 & 2.35127 & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 2.10782 & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 64188583.34 & 2.51903 & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 3.07571 & & \\
\hline 649425.76 & 64188583.34 & 3.85948 & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 5.02073 & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 6 4188583.34 & 6.86387 & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188583.3410 & 10.09063 & & \\
\hline 650425.76 & 6 4188583.34 & 16.73011 & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4188583.3410 & 10.52188 & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 64188583.34 & 7.30378 & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 5.40840 & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 64188583.34 & 4.19111 & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 2.31950 & & \\
\hline 649125.76 & 64188633.34 & 2.17269 & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188633.34 & 2.60507 & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 6 4188633.34 & 3.19399 & 649425.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

4188633.34 4.02964
649525.76 4188633.34 5.28069 649625.76
4188633.34 7.29601
649725.76 4188633.34 10.90689 649825.76
4188633.34 18.57239
649925.76 4188633.34 40.97062 650025.76
4188633.34 0.00000
650125.76 4188633.34 0.00000 650225.76
4188633.34 78.16567
650325.76 4188633.34 29.42868 650425.76
4188633.34 15.85004
650525.76 4188633.34 10.07255
4188633.34 7.04500
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*

```

```

                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
    ***
** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M) CONC
Y-COORD (M) CONC

-     -         -             -                 -                     -                         -                             -                                 -                                     -                                         -                                             -                                                 -                                                     -                                                         -                                                             -                                                                 -                                                                     - 

4188633.34 4.08181
651125.76 4188633.34 2.27657 649125.76
4188683.34 2.20541
649225.76 4188683.34 2.64327 649325.76
4188683.34 3.23861
649425.76 4188683.34 4.08147 649525.76
4188683.34 5.33961
649625.76 4188683.34 7.35772 649725.76
4188683.34 10.94548
649825.76 4188683.34 18.41579 649925.76
4188683.34 38.89260
650025.76 4188683.34 124.25671 650125.76
4188683.34 0.00000
650225.76 4188683.34 51.13420 650325.76

```
\(4188683.34 \quad 23.83691\)
\(650425.76 \quad 4188683.34\)
\(4188683.34 \quad 9.21647\)
650625.764188683 .34
\(4188683.34 \quad 4.98425\) \(650825.76 \quad 4188683.34\)
\(4188683.34 \quad 2.22065\) 649125.764188733 .34
\(4188733.34 \quad 2.62066\) 649325.764188733 .34
\(4188733.34 \quad 4.00272\) \(649525.76 \quad 4188733.34\)
\(4188733.34 \quad 7.07606\) 649725.764188733 .34
\(4188733.34 \quad 16.57388\)
\(649925.76 \quad 4188733.34\)
\(4188733.34 \quad 58.25919\) \(650125.76 \quad 4188733.34\)
\(4188733.34 \quad 28.18613\) \(650325.76 \quad 4188733.34\)
\(4188733.34 \quad 11.39087\) \(650525.76 \quad 4188733.34\)
\(4188733.34 \quad 5.95919\) \(650725.76 \quad 4188733.34\)
\(4188733.34 \quad 3.68343\) \(651125.76 \quad 4188733.34\)
\(4188783.34 \quad 2.14584\) \(649225.76 \quad 4188783.34\)
\(4188783.34 \quad 3.09341\)
\(649425.76 \quad 4188783.34\)
\(4188783.34 \quad 4.95271\)
\(649625.76 \quad 4188783.34\)
\(4188783.34 \quad 9.37334\) \(649825.76 \quad 4188783.34\)
\(4188783.34 \quad 22.99425\)
650025.764188783 .34
\(4188783.34 \quad 23.75767\)
650225.764188783 .34
\(4188783.34 \quad 12.06744\)
\(650425.76 \quad 4188783.34\)
\(4188783.34 \quad 6.73971\)
650625.764188783 .34
\(4188783.34 \quad 4.15719\)
\(650825.76 \quad 4188783.34\)
\(4188783.34 \quad 2.04554\)
\(649125.76 \quad 4188833.34\)
\(4188833.34 \quad 2.46523\)
\(649325.76 \quad 4188833.34\)
\(4188833.34 \quad 3.68281\)
649525.764188833 .34
13.93392
6.59656
3.91721
2.19512
3.19539
5.19529
10.30994
30.92790
50.67916
17.22370
8.02570
4.61082
2.14503
2.55002
3.85086
6.63796
14.20287
29.69502
16.89378
8.91631
5.22333
3.38890
2.08025
2.97886
4.67658
650525.76
651125.76
649225.76
649425.76
650725.76
651125.76
649225.76
649425.76
649625.76
649825.76
650025.76
650225.76
650425.76
650625.76
650825.76
649125.76
649325.76
649525.76
649725.76
649925.76
650125.76
650325.76
650525.76
650725.76
649625.76
```

4188833.34 6.12646
649725.76 4188833.34 8.34243 649825.76
4188833.34 11.96498
649925.76 4188833.34 16.73874 650025.76
4188833.34 17.45384
650125.76 4188833.34 14.45710 650225.76
4188833.34 11.41131
650325.76 4188833.34 8.77333 650425.76
4188833.34 6.92356
650525.76 4188833.34 5.56111 650625.76
4188833.34 4.50351
650725.76 4188833.34 3.68969 650825.76
4188833.34 3.06976
651125.76 4188833.34 1.92591 649125.76
4188883.34 2.01858
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** THE PERIOD ( }43824\mathrm{ HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL5
***
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL5
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
***
** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M) CONC
649225.76 4188883.34 2.38456 649325.76
4188883.34 2.86289
649425.76 4188883.34 3.49982 649525.76
4188883.34 4.36589
649625.76 4188883.34 5.57697 649725.76
4188883.34 7.37423
649825.76 4188883.34 9.99645 649925.76
4188883.34 12.16024
650025.76 4188883.34 11.46185 650125.76
4188883.34 9.89392
650225.76 4188883.34 8.30949 650325.76
4188883.34 6.71475
650425.76 4188883.34 5.48091 650525.76

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4188883.34 & 4.57177 & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{3.85071} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{650725.76} \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188883.34 & & \\
\hline 4188883.34 & 3.25155 & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188883.34 & 2.76121 & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188883.34 & 1.79626 & & \\
\hline 650125.76 & 4188933.34 & 7.26726 & 650225.76 \\
\hline 4188933.34 & 6.35186 & & \\
\hline 650325.76 & 4188933.34 & 5.34015 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188933.34 & 4.46879 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188933.34 & 3.79914 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188933.34 & 3.28217 & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188933.34 & 2.85076 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188933.34 & 2.47567 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188933.34 & 1.66761 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188983.34 & 3.73299 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188983.34 & 3.21962 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188983.34 & 2.81456 & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188983.34 & 2.49122 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188983.34 & 2.21071 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188983.34 & 1.54691 & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4189033.34 & 2.77705 & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4189033.34 & 2.44736 & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4189033.34 & 2.18411 & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4189033.34 & 1.96750 & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4189033.34 & 1.43523 & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4189083.34 & 2.42448 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4189083.34 & 2.15872 & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4189083.34 & 1.93411 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4189083.34 & 1.75372 & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4189083.34 & 1.32976 & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4189133.34 & 2.13661 & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4189133.34 & 1.92314 & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4189133.34 & 1.73326 & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4189133.34 & 1.57445 & 651125.76 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{4189133.34
650781.98} & 1.22805 & & \\
\hline & 4189510.65 & 0.86966 & 650760.33 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
4189397.50
\]} & 1.04446 & & \\
\hline & RSION 19191 *** *** & C: \Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC & \\
\hline (DESKTOP-977GSBU) \D & Documents \HRA\Ashley & *** & \\
\hline *** AERMET - VERSI & ION 18081 *** *** & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U* *** THE PERIOD ( 43824 HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL6 *** INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL6
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{** \({ }^{* *}\) CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3}} \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline X-COORD (M) & Y-COORD (M) & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{CONC} & & X-COORD (M) \\
\hline Y-COORD (M) & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{CONC} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
649676.34 \quad 4188
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{6.89338} & & 649629.66 \\
\hline 4188294.84 & & & & & \\
\hline 649810.15 & 4188312.48 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{11.48115} & & 649364.10 \\
\hline 4188360.20 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{3.20366} \\
\hline 649327.80 & 4188355.01 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2.94998} & & 649380.70 \\
\hline 4188758.52 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{2.91132} \\
\hline 650495.81 & 4188841.51 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2.87581} & & 650597.47 \\
\hline 4188832.17 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{2.58895} \\
\hline 650536.27 & 4188878.85 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2.46551} & & 650577.76 \\
\hline 4188877.81 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{2.35324} \\
\hline 650602.66 & 4188860.18 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2.38920} & & 650610.95 \\
\hline 4188880.93 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{2.24569 ( 2} \\
\hline 650638.10 & 4188858.53 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2.29986} & & 650664.10 \\
\hline 4188331.03 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{6.68207 ( 6} \\
\hline 650668.72 & 4188350.83 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{6.57945} & & 650677.96 \\
\hline 4188379.86 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{6.34565} \\
\hline 650699.74 & 4188414.84 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{5.83949} & & 650758.47 \\
\hline 4188658.36 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{3.33666} \\
\hline 650765.73 & 4188678.82 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{3.13679} & & 650773.65 \\
\hline 4188706.54 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{2.89650 (} \\
\hline 650778.27 & 4188726.34 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2.74145} & & 650805.33 \\
\hline 4188805.53 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{2.18279} \\
\hline 650806.65 & 4188824.01 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2.08429} & & 650811.27 \\
\hline 4188843.81 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{1.97811} \\
\hline 650814.57 & 4188862.29 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1.88758} & & 650846.24 \\
\hline 4188924.98 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{1.59457 ( 1.50} \\
\hline 650850.86 & 4188951.38 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1.50434} & & 650854.82 \\
\hline 4188976.46 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{1.42749 l} \\
\hline 650698.00 & 4188307.32 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{6.03034} & & 650692.60 \\
\hline 4188291.80 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{6.10348 ( 6} \\
\hline 650724.82 & 4189245.80 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1.00305} & & 650726.07 \\
\hline 4189273.37 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{0.96189 l 6} \\
\hline 650856.27 & 4189006.30 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1. 34911} & & 650857.23 \\
\hline 4189022.60 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{1.30963 ( 1.34911} \\
\hline 650859.15 & 4189041.29 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1.26613} & 650859.15 \\
\hline 4189058.54 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{1.23014} \\
\hline 650860.58 & 4189076.28 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1.19358} & 650861.54 \\
\hline 4189094.49 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{1.15838 (} \\
\hline 650857.71 & 4189113.19 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1.12818} & 650847.16 \\
\hline 4189118.94 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{1.12730 (} \\
\hline 650848.12 & 4189134.76 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1.09875} & 650850.04 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{** \({ }^{* *}\) CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/ \(\mathrm{M}^{* * 3}\)} \\
\hline X-COORD (M) & Y-COORD (M) & CONC & X-COORD (M) \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\(Y\)-COORD (M) CONC} \\
\hline - - - - - - & - - - - - & - - - & - - - - - \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- - - - - - - - - - - - - -} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188183.3418 .00971} \\
\hline 650225.76 & 4188183.34 & 18.7091 & 650325.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188183.3415 .78353} \\
\hline 650425.76 & 4188183.34 & 12.2167 & 650525.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188183.34 9.10532} \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188183.34 & 6.8327 & 650725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4188183.345 .26039} \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188183.34 & 4.16512 & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188183.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{2.36887} \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188233.34 & 1.81702 & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{2.13139} \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188233.34 & 2.54026 & 649425.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{3.08549 9} \\
\hline 649525.76 & 4188233.34 & 3.8369 & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{4.91784} \\
\hline 649725.76 & 4188233.34 & 6.53762 & 649825.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{9.02815} \\
\hline 649925.76 & 4188233.34 & 13.39201 & 650025.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{21.39980} \\
\hline 650125.76 & 4188233.34 & 27.38489 & 650225.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 26 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{6.93510} \\
\hline 650325.76 & 4188233.34 & 20.41296 & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188233.3414 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{4.21540} \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188233.34 & 9.91612 & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{7.19067} \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188233.34 & 5.43781 & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188233.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188233.34 & 2.39014 & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1.90610} \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188283.34 & 2.24908 & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{2.70231} \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188283.34 & 3.31967 & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{4.19233} \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188283.34 & 5.48615 & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188283.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{7.52835 ( 7 (} \\
\hline 649825.76 & 4188283.34 & 10.98893 & 649925.76 \\
\hline 4188283.3417 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{7.48323 ( \({ }^{\text {c }}\)} \\
\hline 650025.76 & 4188283.34 & 32.11248 & 650125.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

4188283.34 47.87228
650225.76 4188283.34 40.97819 650325.76
4188283.34 25.79046
650425.76 4188283.34 15.94576 650525.76
4188283.34 10.52549
650625.76 4188283.34 7.44105 650725.76
4188283.34 5.55286
650825.76 4188283.34 4.31791 651125.76
4188283.34 2.39420
649125.76 4188333.34 1.99629 649225.76
4188333.34 2.36914
649325.76 4188333.34
4188333.34 3.55741
649525.76 4188333.34
4188333.34 6.08888
649725.76 4188333.34
4188333.34 13.34700
649925.76 4188333.34
4188333.34 55.25253
650125.76 4188333.34
4188333.34 63.13272
650325.76 4188333.34
4188333.34 17.09568
650525.76 4188333.34
4188333.34 7.54782
650725.76 4188333.34
4188333.34 4.31980
651125.76 4188333.34
4188383.34 2.07937
649225.76 4188383.34
4188383.34 3.02348
649425.76 4188383.34
4188383.34 4.90644
649625.76 4188383.34
4188383.34 9.74377
649825.76 4188383.34
4188383.34 31.80851
650025.76 4188383.34
108.48266
650125.76
86.87975
650325.76
4188383.34 0.00000
650225.76 4188383.34
4188383.34 33.04575
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*** MODELOPTS: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** THE PERIOD ( }43824\mathrm{ HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
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INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL6 , *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** THE PERIOD ( 43824 HRS) AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL6
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL6
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS

```


```

4188880.93 387.98235 (17121904)
650638.10 4188858.53 420.02917 (17021405)

```
650664.10
650677.96
650758.47
650773.65
650805.33
650811.27
650846.24
650854.82
650692.60
650726.07
650857.23
650859.15
650861.54
650847.16
650850.04
650853.87
650857.71
650862.50
650867.77
650872.09
650875.92
650881.19
650888.86
650891.74
650898.45
```

4189475.55 133.25027 (17121904)
650898.45 4189489.93 128.65099 (17121904) 650902.28
4189504.31 125.16821 (17121904)
650709.41 4188344.56 529.16594 (17011303) 650722.45
4188284.03 561.29699 (17011509)
650745.73 4188280.30 482.28966 (17122619) 650735.49
4188223.50 625.42529 (17011509)
650721.52 4188167.62 521.02672 (17122320) 650525.76
4188133.34 713.84000 (17012903)
651125.76 4188133.34 204.61118 (17122619) 649125.76
4188183.34 148.16772 (17013105)
649225.76 4188183.34 162.41781 (17013105) 649325.76
4188183.34 181.67095 (17012823)
649425.76 4188183.34 204.57146 (17121207) 649525.76
4188183.34 234.86789 (17123023)
649625.76 4188183.34 277.55213 (17021308) 649725.76
4188183.34 314.45476 (17021308)
649825.76 4188183.34 365.65447 (17021420) 649925.76
4188183.34 441.94583 (17120517)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
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*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
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4188183.34 207.96425 (17020824)
649125.76 4188233.34 149.18434 (17022506) 649225.76
4188233.34 160.29286 (17022506)
649325.76 4188233.34 184.37966 (17013105)
649425.76
649625.76
649825.76
650025.76
650225.76
650425.76
650625.76
650825.76
649125.76
649325.76
649525.76
649725.76
649925.76
650125.76
650325.76
650525.76
650725.76
651125.76
649225.76
649425.76
649625.76
649825.76
$4188333.34 \quad 406.15016$ (17013105) $649925.764188333 .34 \quad 497.78562$ (17012823) 650025.76
$4188333.34 \quad 652.99368$ (17021308) $650125.764188333 .34 \quad 869.67075$ (17021420)

```
```

    4188333.34 1174.91056 (15011205)
        650325.76 4188333.34 1677.22291 (13011517) 650425.76
    4188333.34 1780.31263 (17122318)
        650525.76 4188333.34 1272.28812 (17011509) 650625.76
    4188333.34 823.06587 (17011509)
        650725.76 4188333.34 502.25335 (17020824) 650825.76
    4188333.34 390.95657 (17121319)
        651125.76 4188333.34 228.07187 (17122519) 649125.76
    4188383.34 150.52670 (17013008)
        649225.76 4188383.34 167.58325 (17013008) 649325.76
    4188383.34 187.56833 (17013008)
        649425.76 4188383.34 211.10123 (17013008) 649525.76
    4188383.34 238.92657 (17013008)
        649625.76 4188383.34 279.33421 (17121807) 649725.76
    4188383.34 338.35754 (17121807)
        649825.76 4188383.34 411.98968 (17121807) 649925.76
    4188383.34 511.90888 (17022506)
        650025.76 4188383.34 671.02359 (17022506) 650125.76
    4188383.34 913.52468 (17011605)
        650225.76 4188383.34 1431.31757 (17021308) 650325.76
    4188383.34 2312.52925 (16010309)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
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                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL1
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
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4188433.34 172.36774 (17011505)
649325.76 4188433.34 193.34411 (17011505) 649425.76
4188433.34 219.04291 (17011505)
649525.76 4188433.34 251.11041 (17011505) 649625.76
4188433.34 291.99731 (17011505)
649725.76 4188433.34 345.52973 (17011505)
4188433.34 417.97855 (17011505)
649925.76 4188433.34 520.28545 (17011505)
4188433.34 673.19275 (17011505)
650125.76 4188433.34 920.76118 (17011505)
4188433.34 1434.71397 (17121420)
650325.76 4188433.34 0.00000 (00000000)
4188433.34 0.00000 (00000000)
650525.76 4188433.34 1304.53810 (17122621)
4188433.34 805.61867 (17122621)
650725.76 4188433.34 557.93468 (17122621)
4188433.34 413.91332 (17122621)
651125.76 4188433.34 219.09953 (16010203)
4188483.34 151.73379 (17120922)
649225.76 4188483.34 169.21309 (17013107)
4188483.34 191.66682 (17013107)
649425.76 4188483.34 219.00207 (17013107) 649525.76
4188483.34 252.71425 (17013107)
649625.76 4188483.34 294.90757 (17013107)
4188483.34 348.59553 (17013107)
650425.76 4188483.34 0.00000 (00000000)
4188483.34 1282.94034 (13032807)
650625.76 4188483.34 799.97901 (14021120)
4188483.34 567.51841 (14022208)
650825.76 4188483.34 442.88312 (14022208)
4188483.34 245.17545 (14022208)
649125.76 4188533.34 151.68918 (17013107)
4188533.34 170.17400 (17122903)
649325.76 4188533.34 192.29284 (17122903)
4188533.34 217.51350 (17122903)
649525.76 4188533.34 247.55237 (17011121)
292.78258 (17121322)
649725.76 4188533.34 344.97393 (17121322)
17121119)
650625.76
650825.76
649125.76
649325.76
649525.76
4188583.34 240.79316 (17120702)
649625.76 4188583.34 269.83070 (17120702) 649725.76

```

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4188683.34 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{172.72282 (17122608)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{649525.76} \\
\hline 649425.76 & 64188683.34 & 200.35477 & (17122608) & \\
\hline 4188683.34 & 223.09590 (171 & (17123105) & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188683.34 & 275.90884 & (17011201) & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188683.34 & 319.64340 (171 & (17120707) & & \\
\hline 649825.76 & 4 4188683.34 & 384.97063 & (17020404) & 649925.76 \\
\hline 4188683.34 & 423.78249 (171 & (17121402) & & \\
\hline 650025.76 & 44188683.34 & 432.23852 & (17120624) & 650125.76 \\
\hline 4188683.34 & 531.86563 (171 & (17123024) & & \\
\hline 650225.76 & 64188683.34 & 678.32637 & (17122724) & 650325.76 \\
\hline 4188683.34 & 878.32017 (17 & (17012717) & & \\
\hline 650425.76 & 4 4188683.34 & 864.73434 & (17012905) & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4188683.34 & 772.44093 (170 & (17021405) & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188683.34 & 586.11176 & (14011617) & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4188683.34 & 485.79915 (17 & (17121119) & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188683.34 & 371.56808 & (13121617) & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188683.34 & 218.13931 (150 & (15010317) & & \\
\hline 649125.76 & 6 4188733.34 & 138.17684 & (17122608) & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188733.34 & 156.49812 (17 & (17122608) & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188733.34 & 172.95052 & (17123105) & 649425.76 \\
\hline 4188733.34 & 202.05784 (17 & (17011201) & & \\
\hline 649525.76 & 4188733.34 & 233.34572 & (17011201) & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188733.34 & 267.65696 (17 & (17121007) & & \\
\hline 649725.76 & 4188733.34 & 315.87878 & (17020404) & 649825.76 \\
\hline 4188733.34 & 335.65799 (17 & (17121402) & & \\
\hline 649925.76 & 4188733.34 & 340.44132 & (17043004) & 650025.76 \\
\hline 4188733.34 & 391.48687 (17 & (17123024) & & \\
\hline 650125.76 & 4188733.34 & 511.72932 & (17122909) & 650225.76 \\
\hline 4188733.34 & 607.51104 (17 & (17022607) & & \\
\hline 650325.76 & 4188733.34 & 721.04394 & (17012717) & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188733.34 & 704.29866 (17 & (17012905) & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188733.34 & 616.52601 & (17122223) & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188733.34 & 544.40807 (171 & (17122321) & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188733.34 & 454.36986 & (17022407) & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188733.34 & 378.38653 (17 & (17121119) & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188733.34 & 213.29550 & (14011317) & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188783.34 & 139.07254 (17 & (17123105) & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188783.34 & 153.71253 & (17011201) & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188783.34 & 180.84652 (17 & (17011201) & & \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188783.34 & 201.35364 & (17120707) & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188783.34 & 231.48618 (171 & (17121007) & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188783.34 & 264.34076 & (17020404) & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188783.34 & 274.61608 (171 & (17121402) & & \\
\hline 649825.76 & 4188783. 34 & 287.72322 & (17043004) & 649925.76 \\
\hline 4188783.34 & 304.25923 (17 & (17120208) & & \\
\hline 650025.76 & 4188783.34 & 349.82147 & (17010902) & 650125.76 \\
\hline 4188783.34 & 422.05988 (16 & (16022108) & & \\
\hline 650225.76 & 4188783.34 & 542.71763 & (17120219) & 650325.76 \\
\hline 4188783.34 & 588.49022 (17 & (17012717) & & \\
\hline 650425.76 & 4188783. 34 & 572.38198 & (17012905) & 650525.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

4188783.34 579.44724 (17022508)
650625.76 4188783.34 491.15918 (17022706) 650725.76
4188783.34 393.51673 (14011617)
650825.76 4188783.34 331.58084 (17123020) 651125.76
4188783.34 203.57031 (14022307)
649125.76 4188833.34 143.04851 (17011201) 649225.76
4188833.34 158.73591 (17011201)
649325.76 4188833.34 177.06678 (17120707) 649425.76
4188833.34 200.76165 (17121007)
649525.76 4188833.34 224.86794 (17020404) 649625.76
4188833.34 230.20370 (17121402)
649725.76 4188833.34 245.66599 (17043004) 649825.76
4188833.34 243.26425 (17121808)
649925.76 4188833.34 289.82951 (17123024) 650025.76
4188833.34 348.88694 (17122909)
650125.76 4188833.34 389.29150 (17122724) 650225.76
4188833.34 477.47970 (17120219)
650325.76 4188833.34 504.94576 (17120618) 650425.76
4188833.34 466.11557 (17012720)
650525.76 4188833.34 520.09971 (17022508) 650625.76
4188833.34 446.75383 (17021405)
650725.76 4188833.34 388.96925 (17122321) 650825.76
4188833.34 335.66221 (17022407)
651125.76 4188833.34 197.89748 (17120617) 649125.76
4188883.34 149.10119 (16012009)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** THE 1ST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL1 ***
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL1
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
****)

```
```

    4188883.34 197.19523 (17120905)
        649625.76 4188883.34 211.89393 (17043004) 649725.76
    4188883.34 206.63710 (17120624)
        649825.76 4188883.34 224.46875 (15022507)
    4188883.34 258.82066 (17123021)
        650025.76 4188883.34 314.57549 (17020506)
    4188883.34 345.53773 (17022607)
        650225.76 4188883.34 385.54659 (17120219)
    4188883.34 449.85698 (17120618)
        650425.76 4188883.34 419.81525 (17012720)
    4188883.34 438.27319 (17022508)
        650625.76 4188883.34 397.86171 (17021405)
    4188883.34 360.51278 (17012601)
        650825.76 4188883.34 287.81159 (17022408)
    4188883.34 189.82709 (14012706)
        650125.76 4188933.34 342.23783 (17022607)
    4188933.34 334.70951 (15021408)
        650325.76 4188933.34 401.30140 (17120618)
    4188933.34 380.19045 (17012720)
        650525.76 4188933.34 385.75391 (17121401)
    4188933.34 338.75371 (17121904)
        650725.76 4188933.34 324.15204 (17022706) 650825.76
    4188933.34 292.73319 (17122321)
        651125.76 4188933.34 200.27082 (17121119) 650425.76
    4188983.34 346.02052 (17012720)
        650525.76 4188983.34 345.13266 (17121401) 650625.76
    4188983.34 309.40506 (17122223)
        650725.76 4188983.34 296.98929 (17021405) 650825.76
    4188983.34 266.62966 (17012601)
        651125.76 4188983.34 189.12487 (17123020) 650525.76
    4189033.34 305.27871 (17120207)
        650625.76 4189033.34 302.99989 (17022508) 650725.76
    4189033.34 282.33199 (17021405)
        650825.76 4189033.34 255.16529 (17012601) 651125.76
    4189033.34 167.40655 (17120122)
        650525.76 4189083.34 288.07368 (17120207) 650625.76
    4189083.34 284.76916 (17022508)
        650725.76 4189083.34 246.27417 (17121904) 650825.76
    4189083.34 234.14715 (17022706)
        651125.76 4189083.34 179.17600 (17022407) 650525.76
    4189133.34 266.63323 (17120207)
650625.76 4189133.34 256.88331 (17022508) 650725.76
4189133.34 223.40255 (17121904)
650825.76 4189133.34 214.42543 (17021405) 651125.76
4189133.34 163.32503 (17022407)
650781.98 4189510.65 146.98196 (17022508) 650760.33
4189397.50 167.75798 (17022508)
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4189273.37 127.38498 (17022407)
650856.27 4189006.30 122.77619 (17120617) 650857.23
4189022.60 119.76841 (17120617)
650859.15 4189041.29 119.31948 (14012706) 650859.15
4189058.54 118.18024 (14012706)
650860.58 4189076.28 120.42073 (13103008) 650861.54
4189094.49 123.09969 (17121119)
650857.71 4189113.19 125.71053 (17121119) 650847.16
4189118.94 127.04820 (17121119)
650848.12 4189134.76 125.02814 (17121119) 650850.04
4189155.37 122.52592 (17123020)
650851.48 4189171.66 122.60968 (17123020) 650853.87
4189184.12 121.43298 (17123020)
650856.75 4189199.46 118.88941 (17123020)
650857.71
650862.50
650867.77
650872.09
650875.92
650881.19
650888.86
650891.74
650898.45
650902.28
650722.45
650735.49
4188223.50 157.09470 (17121319)
650721.52 4188167.62 156.03188 (17011303) 650525.76
4188133.34 205.72809 (17121906)
651125.76 4188133.34 100.86347 (17121319)
4188183.34 327.77246 (17021308)
649225.76 4188183.34 374.50009 (17021420)
649325.76
4188183.34 449.32068 (17121504)
649425.76 4188183.34 516.07621 (13012121)
649525.76
4188183.34 651.10657 (13013108)
649625.76 4188183.34 786.61607 (13020205) 649725.76
4188183.34 938.68683 (17011609)
649825.76 4188183.34 1014.39376 (17122917)
649925.76
4188183.34 863.20920 (17020801)
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4188283.34 330.99614 (17013105)
649225.76 4188283.34 392.72551 (17121207) 649325.76
4188283.34 488.31013 (17021308)
649425.76 4188283.34 633.94499 (17021308)
4188283.34 805.81905 (17121504)
649625.76 4188283.34 1060.90431 (13013108)
4188283.34 1381.56776 (14012608)
649825.76 4188283.34 1486.08404 (17122701)
4188283.34 1092.02611 (17012908)
650025.76 4188283.34 949.08342 (17011509)
4188283.34 521.26219 (17122619)
650225.76 4188283.34 383.02100 (17020824) 650325.76
4188283.34 304.96714 (17011303)
650425.76 4188283.34 258.69436 (17121319) 650525.76
4188283.34 214.75852 (17010504
650625.76 4188283.34 186.64484 (17122519) 650725.76
4188283.34 168.57538 (17122519)
650825.76 4188283.34 149.85302 (17122519) 651125.76
4188283.34 105.14587 (17122719)
649125.76 4188333.34 336.19419 (17022506) 649225.76
4188333.34 407.14855 (17022506)
649325.76 4188333.34 505.25281 (17013105)
649425.76
4188333.34 638.60536 (17121823)
649525.76 4188333.34 923.82743 (17021308)
649625.76
4188333.34 1208.55392 (17121504)
649725.76 4188333.34 1783.35496 (14021408)
649825.76
4188333.34 1942.39047 (17122318)
649925.76 4188333.34 1459.51143 (17011509)
650025.76
4188333.34 755.87023 (17121906)
650125.76 4188333.34 514.27279 (17011303)
4188333.34 399.33989 (17121319)
650325.76 4188333.34 322.99610 (17122519) 650425.76
4188333.34 274.57774 (17122519)
650525.76 4188333.34 229.65828 (17122519) 650625.76
4188333.34 191.37136 (17122719)
650725.76 4188333.34 166.63982 (17122719) 650825.76
4188333.34 145.13365 (17122719)
651125.76 4188333.34 101.97730 (17122621) 649125.76
4188383.34 330.40847 (17013008)
649225.76 4188383.34 402.29020 (17121807)
4188383.34 511.78653 (17121807)
649425.76 4188383.34 658.37755 (17121807)
649525.76
649725.76
649925.76
4188383.34 1235.39049 (17121906)
650025.76 4188383.34 781.12621 (17122519)
650125.76
4188383.34 567.53804 (17122519)
650225.76 4188383.34 416.13648 (17122719) 650325.76

```

```

4188483.34 524.96133 (17121322)
649425.76 4188483.34 668.16461 (17121322) 649525.76
4188483.34 896.27635 (17122608)
649625.76 4188483.34 1374.26314 (17011201) 649725.76
4188483.34 2142.77393 (17122909)
650425.76 4188483.34 284.06694 (14022208) 650525.76
4188483.34 242.04445 (14022208)
650625.76 4188483.34 208.61257 (14022208) 650725.76
4188483.34 181.65845 (14022208)
650825.76 4188483.34 159.64691 (14022208)
4188483.34 113.42374 (14022208)
649125.76 4188533.34 329.76024 (17120702)
4188533.34 383.61948 (17120702)
649325.76 4188533.34 488.47481 (17122608)
4188533.34 645.02672 (17011201)
649525.76 4188533.34 879.98907 (17121007)
4188533.34 1056.98024 (17122609)
649725.76 4188533.34 1492.21222 (17122724)
4188533.34 268.90860 (14021120)
650525.76 4188533.34 228.67328 (15122424)
4188533.34 196.64490 (14021603)
650725.76 4188533.34 169.59746 (14021603)
4188533.34 147.20514 (15020206)
651125.76 4188533.34 109.53019 (14022208)
4188583.34 318.63895 (17122608)
649225.76 4188583.34 378.07779 (17122608)
4188583.34 493.65414 (17011201)
649425.76 4188583.34 630.27534 (17020404)
4188583.34 704.68190 (17043004)
649625.76 4188583.34 876.84310 (17122909)
4188583.34 1193.02476 (17120219)
650425.76 4188583.34 268.92935 (15122617)
4188583.34 224.31984 (14010519)
650625.76 4188583.34 192.88091 (14010519)
4188583.34 165.09756 (14021120)
650825.76 4188583.34 147.63072 (15122424)
4188583.34 106.87072 (14021603)
649125.76 4188633.34 325.33294 (17011201)
4188633.34 384.49877 (17120707)
649325.76 4188633.34 479.23144 (17020404) 649425.76
4188633.34 517.75749 (17043004)
649525.76 4188633.34 562.19123 (17123024) 649625.76
4188633.34 762.51849 (17122909)
649725.76 4188633.34 975.98379 (17012717) 649825.76
4188633.34 999.69067 (17012905)
649925.76 4188633.34 858.01537 (17022706) 650025.76
4188633.34 667.01485 (17022407)
650125.76 4188633.34 509.40309 (17121119) 650225.76
4188633.34 384.92587 (14022307)
650325.76 4188633.34 319.34935 (14011317) 650425.76

```


```

    4188833.34 171.77765 (14022307)
    650725.76 4188833.34 153.45784 (13020908) 650825.76
    4188833.34 137.80998 (14011317)
    651125.76 4188833.34 103.32600 (15010317) 649125.76
    4188883.34 199.27555 (17121808)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
*** THE 1ST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL2
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL2 ,
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
***


```
4188933.34 165.57217 (17121119)
    650725.76 4188933.34 145.89141 (17120617) 650825.76
4188933.34 129.27671 (14022307)
    651125.76 4188933.34 98.59980 (14011317) 650425.76
4188983.34 216.07445 (17022407)
    650525.76 4188983.34 179.55698 (17123020) 650625.76
4188983.34 170.83516 (17121119)
    650725.76 4188983.34 140.18358 (14012706) 650825.76
4188983.34 128.18569 (17120617)
    651125.76 4188983.34 96.31138 (14022106) 650525.76
4189033.34 175.40224 (17022407)
    650625.76 4189033.34 163.05357 (17123020) 650725.76
4189033.34 149.32454 (17121119)
    650825.76 4189033.34 123.84825 (14012706) 651125.76
4189033.34 94.15169 (14022307)
    650525.76 4189083.34 177.39619 (17022407) 650625.76
4189083.34 141.28669 (13121217)
    650725.76 4189083.34 144.32553 (17123020) 650825.76
4189083.34 130.28488 (17121119)
    651125.76 4189083.34 91.44396 (14022307) 650525.76
4189133.34 157.24129 (14011617)
    650625.76 4189133.34 152.35936 (17022407) 650725.76
4189133.34 130.56285 (17123020)
    650825.76 4189133.34 125.74049 (17123020) 651125.76
4189133.34 91.83566 (17120617)
    650781.98 4189510.65 104.73102 (17122321) 650760.33
4189397.50 106.21038 (17120205)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
    *** THE 1ST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL3
                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL3 ,
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
                                    ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
    X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH) X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH)
    649676.34 4188314.55 681.33150 (14021105) 649629.66
```

```
4188294.84 630.80116 (17123007)
    649810.15 4188312.48 742.23278 (15011509) 649364.10
4188360.20 440.46022 (15010907)
    649327.80 4188355.01 426.41183 (17120517) 649380.70
4188758.52 572.58347 (17011201)
    650495.81 4188841.51 233.69794 (15010317) 650597.47
4188832.17 200.12253 (15122617)
    650536.27 4188878.85 211.69913 (15010317) 650577.76
4188877.81 203.24711 (15010317)
    650602.66 4188860.18 195.31754 (13020204) 650610.95
4188880.93 193.74461 (15010317)
    650638.10 4188858.53 184.66770 (15122617) 650664.10
4188331.03 166.35844 (17020824)
    650668.72 4188350.83 159.56668 (17011303) 650677.96
4188379.86 165.71262 (17011303)
    650699.74 4188414.84 165.67270 (17121319) 650758.47
4188658.36 169.41617 (14022208)
    650765.73 4188678.82 172.24310 (14022208) 650773.65
4188706.54 165.36831 (14022208)
        650778.27 4188726.34 157.08260 (15020206)
4188805.53 147.44902 (14010519)
        650806.65 4188824.01 150.33329 (14010519)
4188843.81 147.74195 (14010519)
        650814.57 4188862.29 146.26042 (13032807)
4188924.98 139.44568 (13020204)
        650850.86 4188951.38 139.63616 (15010317) 650854.82
4188976.46 136.04548 (15010317)
        650698.00 4188307.32 160.80008 (17020824)
4188291.80 160.95256 (17020824)
        650724.82 4189245.80 148.50793 (17121119)
4189273.37 143.89672 (17123020)
        650856.27 4189006.30 132.77623 (13121420)
4189022.60 132.45675 (14010220)
        650859.15 4189041.29 132.53683 (14011317)
        650860.58 4189076.28 129.14062 (13020908) 650861.54
4189094.49 128.37911 (13020908)
        650857.71 4189113.19 126.48900 (14022307)
        14022307)
650850.04
650853.87
650857.71
4189213.36 121.87665 (17120617)
        650860.58 4189226.30 119.22685 (17120617)
650862.50
4189242.60 118.73028 (14012706)
        650865.38 4189258.42 117.79736 (14012706) 650867.77
4189275.19 118.12554 (13103008)
        650868.73 4189291.49 120.99385 (13103008)
650872.09
```

```
4189309.23 122.31833 (17121119)
    650874.00 4189325.04 123.12632 (17121119) 650875.92
4189340.38 122.51045 (17121119)
    650878.80 4189355.24 120.62518 (17121119) 650881.19
4189373.45 117.38600 (17123020)
    650884.55 4189390.71 117.78872 (17123020) 650888.86
4189407.01 116.68332 (17123020)
    650889.82 4189427.14 113.75579 (17123020) 650891.74
4189443.43 109.84905 (17123020)
    650895.09 4189461.17 104.51445 (17123020) 650898.45
4189475.55 99.61837 (17123020)
    650898.45 4189489.93 97.87820 (13121217) 650902.28
4189504.31 97.09061 (13121217)
    650709.41 4188344.56 153.57388 (17011303) 650722.45
4188284.03 155.01084 (17020824)
    650745.73 4188280.30 150.72523 (17020824) 650735.49
4188223.50 151.05914 (17122619)
    650721.52 4188167.62 141.71718 (17011509) 650525.76
4188133.34 225.61151 (17011509)
        651125.76 4188133.34 97.13339 (17020824) 649125.76
4188183.34 251.98777 (17123107)
        649225.76 4188183.34 290.08656 (14120608) 649325.76
4188183.34 334.54943 (13013108)
        649425.76 4188183.34 368.65301 (15122802) 649525.76
4188183.34 416.76867 (17121508)
        649625.76 4188183.34 464.41953 (14021105) 649725.76
4188183.34 560.13257 (17011609)
        649825.76 4188183.34 508.07070 (17120822) 649925.76
4188183.34 504.15825 (17122701)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL3 % NHE N** IST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
                                    ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
        X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH) X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH)
```

| 650025.76 | 4188183.34 | 457.80893 | (17020801) | 650125.76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4188183.34 | 370.99174 (17120120) |  |  |  |
| 650225.76 | 4188183.34 | 317.46796 | (17012908) | 650325.76 |
| 4188183.34 | 302.04352 (17 | (17122320) |  |  |
| 650425.76 | 4188183.34 | 261.20556 | (17121219) | 650525.76 |
| 4188183.34 | 264.91468 (17 | (17011509) |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 4188183.34 | 202.66189 | (17011509) | 650725.76 |
| 4188183.34 | 146.42640 (17 | (17122619) |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 4188183.34 | 134.38606 | (17122619) | 651125.76 |
| 4188183.34 | 93.48001 (17 | (17020824) |  |  |
| 649125.76 | 4188233.34 | 276.21558 | (17120517) | 649225.76 |
| 4188233.34 | 304.20239 (1301 | (13012105) |  |  |
| 649325.76 | 4188233.34 | 350.26234 | (13021704) | 649425.76 |
| 4188233.34 | 408.71026 (16 | (16010309) |  |  |
| 649525.76 | 4188233.34 | 464.21538 | (13020205) | 649625.76 |
| 4188233.34 | 534.33189 (171 | (17122918) |  |  |
| 649725.76 | 4188233.34 | 639.44861 | (17011609) | 649825.76 |
| 4188233.34 | 593.85865 (171 | (17122917) |  |  |
| 649925.76 | 4188233.34 | 567.53658 | (17012804) | 650025.76 |
| 4188233.34 | 509.85489 (17 | (17020801) |  |  |
| 650125.76 | 4188233.34 | 420.41553 | (17012908) | 650225.76 |
| 4188233.34 | 333.73197 (17 | (17122320) |  |  |
| 650325.76 | 4188233.34 | 319.89659 | (17121219) | 650425.76 |
| 4188233.34 | 312.22040 (17 | (17011509) |  |  |
| 650525.76 | 4188233.34 | 244.62500 | (17011509) | 650625.76 |
| 4188233.34 | 170.84346 (17 | (17122619) |  |  |
| 650725.76 | 4188233.34 | 152.03700 | (17122619) | 650825.76 |
| 4188233.34 | 133.04206 (17 | (17020824) |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188233.34 | 97.08054 | (17011303) | 649125.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 293.90113 (17 | (17121504) |  |  |
| 649225.76 | 4188283.34 | 323.42589 | (17120517) | 649325.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 376.75846 | (13010908) |  |  |
| 649425.76 | 4188283.34 | 448.64431 | (13013108) | 649525.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 518.32390 (15 | (15010507) |  |  |
| 649625.76 | 64188283.34 | 610.70165 | (17123007) | 649725.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 728.82907 (17 | (17011609) |  |  |
| 649825.76 | 4188283.34 | 708.01754 | (17122917) | 649925.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 660.03428 (17 | (17122620) |  |  |
| 650025.76 | 4188283.34 | 543.85755 | (17120120) | 650125.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 436.47388 (17 | (17012908) |  |  |
| 650225.76 | 4188283.34 | 391.40572 | (17122320) | 650325.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 370.35867 (17 | (17011509) |  |  |
| 650425.76 | 4 4188283.34 | 301.04733 | (17011509) | 650525.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 202.57504 | (17122619) |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 6 4188283.34 | 173.41914 | (17121906) | 650725.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 154.38906 (170 | (17020824) |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 64188283.34 | 131.42179 | (17020824) | 651125.76 |
| 4188283.34 | 95.30529 (17 | (17121319) |  |  |
| 649125.76 | 64188333.34 | 305.25237 | (17021420) | 649225.76 |

```
4188333.34 357.26572 (17121504)
    649325.76 4188333.34 395.71658 (15010907) 649425.76
4188333.34 477.78068 (13010906)
    649525.76 4188333.34 577.72516 (16010309) 649625.76
4188333.34 653.19164 (15022608)
    649725.76 4188333.34 827.25296 (17011609) 649825.76
4188333.34 844.08099 (17122917)
    649925.76 4188333.34 745.99913 (17012903) 650025.76
4188333.34 568.68235 (17012908)
    650125.76 4188333.34 485.27302 (17122320) 650225.76
4188333.34 440.72260 (17011509)
    650325.76 4188333.34 379.38682 (17011509) 650425.76
4188333.34 244.99024 (17122619)
    650525.76 4188333.34 205.38543 (17121906) 650625.76
4188333.34 178.51910 (17020824)
    650725.76 4188333.34 147.34061 (17011303) 650825.76
4188333.34 136.29353 (17011303)
    651125.76 4188333.34 100.95351 (17121319) 649125.76
4188383.34 326.15496 (17021308)
    649225.76 4188383.34 373.42114 (17021420)) 649325.76
4188383.34 446.79287 (17121504)
    649425.76 4188383.34 514.01566 (13012121))}649525.7
4188383.34 646.96167 (13013108)
    649625.76 4188383.34 780.24341 (13020205))}649725.7
4188383.34 931.62835 (17011609)
    649825.76 4188383.34 1003.10979 (17122917) 649925.76
4188383.34 854.61854 (17020801)
    650025.76 4188383.34 647.19646 (17012908) 650125.76
4188383.34 543.39780 (17121219)
    650225.76 4188383.34 492.49960 (17011509) 650325.76
4188383.34 303.73410 (17122619)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
```



```
                                    ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH) X-COORD (M)
```



```
4188533.34 191.74817 (17122519)
    650725.76 4188533.34 166.50621 (17122719) 650825.76
4188533.34 145.36566 (17122719)
    651125.76 4188533.34 101.55904 (17122621) 649125.76
4188583.34 327.99560 (17013008)
    649225.76 4188583.34 403.57727 (17121807) 649325.76
4188583.34 510.66925 (17121807)
    649425.76 4188583.34 659.14096 (17022506) 649525.76
4188583.34 907.77489 (17022506)
    649625.76 4188583.34 1407.08353 (17021308) 649725.76
4188583.34 0.00000 (00000000)
    650425.76 4188583.34 265.93349 (17122621) 650525.76
4188583.34 224.25517 (17122621)
    650625.76 4188583.34 191.79763 (17122621)) 650725.76
4188583.34 166.06578 (17122621)
    650825.76 4188583.34 145.32107 (17122621)) 651125.76
4188583.34 102.47307 (17122621)
    649125.76 4188633.34 346.84178 (17011505)) 649225.76
4188633.34 419.97488 (17011505)
    649325.76 4188633.34 523.44462 (17011505) 649425.76
4188633.34 678.43152 (17011505)
    649525.76 4188633.34 929.91503 (17011505) 649625.76
4188633.34 1417.32300 (17121203)
    649725.76 4188633.34 0.00000 (00000000) 649825.76
4188633.34 0.00000 (00000000)
    649925.76 4188633.34 1412.41421 (14022208) 650025.76
4188633.34 861.71996 (14022208)
        650125.76 4188633.34 592.83626 (14022208) 650225.76
4188633.34 438.19586 (14022208)
        650325.76 4188633.34 339.92512 (14022208) 650425.76
4188633.34 273.16824 (16010203)
                650525.76 4188633.34 228.00557 (16010203) 650625.76
4188633.34 194.14946 (16010203)
* *** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
    *** AERMET - VERSION 18081 *** ***
                                    16:20:52
                                    PAGE 55
*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
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```
4188783.34 709.03671 (17043004)
    649625.76 4188783.34 871.45368 (17122909) 649725.76
4188783.34 1201.78055 (17120219)
    649825.76 4188783.34 1311.63009 (17022508) 649925.76
4188783.34 989.38550 (17122321)
    650025.76 4188783.34 740.78424 (17121119) 650125.76
4188783.34 521.23472 (13020908)
    650225.76 4188783.34 402.07794 (14011317) 650325.76
4188783.34 325.15650 (13020204)
    650425.76 4188783.34 268.13303 (15122617) 650525.76
4188783.34 224.75628 (14010519)
        650625.76 4188783.34 192.28988 (14010519)
650725.76
4188783.34 165.15725 (14021120)
        650825.76 4188783.34 147.75368 (15122424
651125.76
4188783.34 106.65789 (14021603)
        649125.76 4188833.34 324.03366 (17011201) 649225.76
4188833.34 384.22450 (17120707)
        649325.76 4188833.34 478.90989 (17020404) 649425.76
4188833.34 518.85355 (17043004)
        649525.76 4188833.34 564.07054 (17120208) 649625.76
4188833.34 769.95811 (17122909)
        649725.76 4188833.34 979.09386 (17012717) 649825.76
4188833.34 1004.11304 (17012905)
        649925.76 4188833.34 860.62082 (17022706) 650025.76
4188833.34 665.58449 (17022407)
        650125.76 4188833.34 505.71654 (17121119) 650225.76
4188833.34 384.47756 (14022307)
    650325.76 4188833.34 318.88266 (14011317) 650425.76
4188833.34 263.78960 (15010317)
    650525.76 4188833.34 220.57853 (13020204) 650625.76
4188833.34 191.46592 (15122617)
    650725.76 4188833.34 164.16731 (13120917) 650825.76
4188833.34 146.77074 (14010519)
    651125.76 4188833.34 105.34230 (15122424) 649125.76
4188883.34 316.50395 (17121007)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
```



```
    X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH) X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH)
```

    \(649225.76 \quad 4188883.34 \quad 379.04071\) (17020404) 649325.76
    \(4188883.34 \quad 398.82797\) (17043004)
    \(649425.76 \quad 4188883.34 \quad 413.29783\) (17120208) 649525.76
    \(4188883.34 \quad 495.77759\) (14012407)
    \(\begin{array}{lllll}649625.76 & 4188883.34 & 644.96329 & \text { (17122724) } 649725.76\end{array}\)
    \(4188883.34 \quad 824.07387\) (17012717)
    \(649825.76 \quad 4188883.34 \quad 810.20193\) (17012905) 649925.76
    \(4188883.34 \quad 733.46895\) (17021405)
        \(650025.76 \quad 4188883.34 \quad 589.73337\) (17122321) 650125.76
    \(4188883.34 \quad 468.22807\) (17123020)
        \(650225.76 \quad 4188883.34 \quad 364.77467\) (14012706) 650325.76
    \(4188883.34 \quad 301.23630\) (14022307)
        \(650425.76 \quad 4188883.34 \quad 256.34545\) (14011317) 650525.76
    \(4188883.34 \quad 214.33746\) (13121420)
        \(650625.76 \quad 4188883.34 \quad 189.43108\) (15010317) 650725.76
    \(4188883.34 \quad 162.36800\) (15122617)
        \(\begin{array}{lllll}650825.76 & 4188883.34 & 145.76914 & \text { (15122617) } & 651125.76\end{array}\)
    \(4188883.34 \quad 105.11015\) (14010519)
        \(650125.76 \quad 4188933.34 \quad 450.11949\) (17022407) 650225.76
    \(4188933.34 \quad 366.96287\) (17121119)
        \(650325.76 \quad 4188933.34 \quad 285.78186\) (14012706) 650425.76
    \(4188933.34 \quad 244.11456\) (14022307)
        \(650525.764188933 .34 \quad 209.10641\) (14011317) 650625.76
        \(4188933.34 \quad 181.36979\) (14010220)
        \(650725.764188933 .34 \quad 161.34439\) (15010317) 650825.76
        \(4188933.34 \quad 143.12118\) (15010317)
        \(651125.764188933 .34 \quad 103.11460\) (13032807) 650425.76
        \(\begin{array}{cccccc}4188983.34 & 234.22277 & (13121617) & & \\ 650525.76 & 4188983.34 & 202.94963 & (14022307) & 650625.76\end{array}\)
        4188983.34 178.21877 (13020908)
        \(650725.76 \quad 4188983.34 \quad 157.86438\) (14011317) 650825.76
    4188983.34138 .55455 (13121420)
        \(651125.764188983 .34 \quad 103.01923\) (15122617) 650525.76
    4189033.34 196.64027 (17120617)
$650625.764189033 .34 \quad 172.15697$ (14022307) 650725.76
$4189033.34 \quad 153.56967$ (13020908)
$650825.764189033 .34 \quad 137.89561$ (14011317) 651125.76
$4189033.34 \quad 103.22294$ (15010317)
$650525.764189083 .34 \quad 199.11722$ (17121119) 650625.76
$4189083.34 \quad 168.21974$ (17120617)
$650725.764189083 .34 \quad 148.41358$ (14022307) 650825.76
$4189083.34 \quad 133.64051$ (13020908)
$\begin{array}{lllll}651125.76 & 4189083.34 & 99.09860 & (13121420) & 650525.76\end{array}$

```
4189133.34 195.22972 (17121119)
    650625.76 4189133.34 164.51674 (17121119) 650725.76
4189133.34 145.98691 (17120617)
    650825.76 4189133.34 129.63421 (14022307) 651125.76
4189133.34 98.49643 (14011317)
    650781.98 4189510.65 120.70473 (17022407) 650760.33
4189397.50 115.81421 (17120122)
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| 4188805.53 | 418.24983 (14011317) |  |  | 650811.27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 650806.65 | 4188824.01 | 403. 25781 | (13020908) |  |
| 4188843.81 | 386.80604 (14 | (14022307) |  |  |
| 650814.57 | 4188862.29 | 381.30376 | (13121617) | 650846.24 |
| 4188924.98 | 355.99912 (171 | (17121119) |  |  |
| 650850.86 | 4188951.38 | 344.77582 | (17121119) | 650854.82 |
| 4188976.46 | 328.03347 (17 | (17123020) |  |  |
| 650698.00 | 4188307.32 | 475.72069 | (17012908) | 650692.60 |
| 4188291.80 | 484.52171 (17 | (17012908) |  |  |
| 650724.82 | 4189245.80 | 265.05180 | (17021405) | 650726.07 |
| 4189273.37 | 244.37316 (171 | (17121904) |  |  |
| 650856.27 | 4189006.30 | 291.47518 | (17022407) | 650857.23 |
| 4189022.60 | 304.28995 (17 | (17022407) |  |  |
| 650859.15 | 4189041.29 | 307.91674 | (17022407) | 650859.15 |
| 4189058.54 | 302.80534 (17 | (17022407) |  |  |
| 650860.58 | 4189076.28 | 288.24606 | (17022407) | 650861.54 |
| 4189094.49 | 269.72205 (14 | (14011617) |  |  |
| 650857.71 | 4189113.19 | 263.70527 | (17022408) | 650847.16 |
| 4189118.94 | 271.02907 (17 | (17122321) |  |  |
| 650848.12 | 4189134.76 | 274.42728 | (17122321) | 650850.04 |
| 4189155.37 | 271.23618 (17 | (17122321) |  |  |
| 650851.48 | 4189171.66 | 263.74918 | (17122321) | 650853.87 |
| 4189184.12 | 255.69870 (171 | (17122321) |  |  |
| 650856.75 | 4189199.46 | 243.91712 | (17122321) | 650857.71 |
| 4189213.36 | 242.84365 (17 | (17012601) |  |  |
| 650860.58 | 4189226.30 | 242.14631 | (17012601) | 650862.50 |
| 4189242.60 | 240.21752 (17 | (17012601) |  |  |
| 650865.38 | 4189258.42 | 235.64493 | (17012601) | 650867.77 |
| 4189275.19 | 228.87639 (17 | (17012601) |  |  |
| 650868.73 | 4189291.49 | 220.09802 | (17012601) | 650872.09 |
| 4189309.23 | 209.90685 (17 | (17022706) |  |  |
| 650874.00 | 4189325.04 | 208.02995 | (17022706) | 650875.92 |
| 4189340.38 | 204.86822 (17 | (17022706) |  |  |
| 650878.80 | 4189355.24 | 200.61555 | (17022706) | 650881.19 |
| 4189373.45 | 194.38673 (17 | (17022706) |  |  |
| 650884.55 | 4189390.71 | 187.60865 | (17022706) | 650888.86 |
| 4189407.01 | 181.99166 (17 | (17022324) |  |  |
| 650889.82 | 4189427.14 | 179.43208 | (17021405) | 650891.74 |
| 4189443.43 | 179.54643 (17 | (17021405) |  |  |
| 650895.09 | 4189461.17 | 178.06115 | (17021405) | 650898.45 |
| 4189475.55 | 176.08511 (17 | (17021405) |  |  |
| 650898.45 | 4189489.93 | 174.44968 | (17021405) | 650902.28 |
| 4189504.31 | 171.47717 (17 | (17021405) |  |  |
| 650709.41 | 4188344.56 | 488.84495 | (17122320) | 650722.45 |
| 4188284.03 | 435.57616 (17 | (17012908) |  |  |
| 650745.73 | 4188280.30 | 379.59013 | (17012908) | 650735.49 |
| 4188223.50 | 399.82640 (17 | (17012908) |  |  |
| 650721.52 | 4188167.62 | 374.57696 | (17120120) | 650525.76 |
| 4188133.34 | 452.75748 (17 | (17122701) |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188133.34 | 220.24354 | (17011509) | 649125.76 |

```
4188183.34 144.77626 (17021308)
    649225.76 4188183.34 153.15098 (17021308) 649325.76
4188183.34 170.18542 (17120203)
    649425.76 4188183.34 186.28414 (17123002) 649525.76
4188183.34 211.68130 (17121504)
    649625.76 4188183.34 233.92308 (17120517) 649725.76
4188183.34 250.61592 (13012121)
    649825.76 4188183.34 288.31564 (14120608) 649925.76
4188183.34 329.25653 (13013108)
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```
***
```



```
4188233.34 403.03905 (16010309)
    650125.76 4188233.34 461.33383 (13020205) 650225.76
4188233.34 520.31924 (17122918)
    650325.76 4188233.34 625.76921 (17011609)
4188233.34 590.21428 (17122917)
    650525.76 4188233.34 553.44397 (17012804)
4188233.34 496.71070 (17020801)
    650725.76 4188233.34 410.77864 (17012908)
4188233.34 324.69679 (17122320)
    651125.76 4188233.34 245.01129 (17011509)
4188283.34 141.89042 (17121207)
    649225.76 4188283.34 159.65878 (17123023)
4188283.34 175.88041 (17021308)
    649425.76 4188283.34 205.41401 (17021308)
4188283.34 222.64681 (17120203)
    649625.76 4188283.34 251.17271 (17021420)
4188283.34 292.31996 (17121504)
    649825.76 4188283.34 318.42945 (15010907)
4188283.34 371.34739 (13010908)
    650025.76 4188283.34 441.21725 (13013108)
4188283.34 512.22513 (15010507)
    650225.76 4188283.34 599.18402 (17123007)
4188283.34 718.37230 (17011609)
    650425.76 4188283.34 696.93239 (17122917)
4188283.34 640.90511 (17122620)
    650625.76 4188283.34 529.72327 (17120120)
4188283.34 428.53864 (17012908)
    650825.76 4188283.34 384.56415 (17122320)
4188283.34 198.54688 (17122619)
    649125.76 4188333.34 144.29453 (17012823)
4188333.34 160.37291 (17121207)
    649325.76 4188333.34 176.73758 (17123023)
4188333.34 201.16483 (17123023)
        649525.76 4188333.34 237.13403 (17021308)
4188333.34 259.84508 (17021308)
        649725.76 4188333.34 301.76646 (17021420)
    649825.76
    650025.76
    650225.76
    650425.76
4188333.34 821.55102 (17122917)
        650525.76 4188333.34 723.90545 (17012903) 650625.76
4188333.34 552.03928 (17012908)
        650725.76 4188333.34 470.66135 (17122320)
    650825.76
4188333.34 426.49515 (17011509)
        651125.76 4188333.34 202.81066 (17121906)
649125.76
4188383.34 146.71467 (17013105)
        649225.76 4188383.34 163.65335
            (17013105)
649325.76
```

```
4188383.34 180.12964 (17012823)
    649425.76 4188383.34 204.23272 (17121207) 649525.76
4188383.34 232.99255 (17123023)
    649625.76 4188383.34 271.43114 (17021308) 649725.76
4188383.34 321.83891 (17021308)
    649825.76 4188383.34 370.68847 (17021420) 649925.76
4188383.34 439.45806 (17121504)
    650025.76 4188383.34 509.42506 (15011205) 650125.76
4188383.34 635.87606 (13013108)
    650225.76 4188383.34 764.34920 (13020205) 650325.76
4188383.34 939.41222 (17011609)
^ *** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
*** AERMET - VERSION 18081
                                    16:20:52
PAGE 59
```

```
*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
```

*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: vOL4 *** THE 1S* HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
***

| ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| X-COORD (M) | Y-COORD (M) | CONC | (YYMMDDHH) | X-COORD (M) |
| Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 650425.76 | 4188383.34 | 963.66350 | (17122917) | 650525.76 |
| $4188383.34 \quad 825.60544$ (17020801) |  |  |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 4188383.34 | 630.36822 | (17012908) | 650725.76 |
| 4188383.34 529.60826 (17121219) |  |  |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 4188383.34 | 486.37820 | (17011509) | 651125.76 |
| 4188383.34 203.92832 (17020824) |  |  |  |  |
| 649125.76 | 4188433.34 | 149.77491 | (17022506) | 649225.76 |
| $4188433.34 \quad 163.29064$ (17022506) |  |  |  |  |
| 649325.76 | 4188433.34 | 180.81155 | (17013105) | 649425.76 |
| $4188433.34 \quad 209.30314$ (17013105) |  |  |  |  |
| 649525.76 | 4188433.34 | 234.13069 | (17012823) | 649625.76 |
| $4188433.34 \quad 272.63963$ (17121207) |  |  |  |  |
| 649725.76 | 4188433.34 | 321.81217 | (17123023) | 649825.76 |
| 4188433.34 401.23035 (17021308) |  |  |  |  |
| 649925.76 | 4188433.34 | 468.36251 | (17021420) | 650025.76 |
| 4188433.34 572.16007 (17120517) |  |  |  |  |
| 650125.76 | 4188433.34 | 695.93949 | (13022803) | 650225.76 |

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{875.47552 (15010507)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{650425.76} \\
\hline 650325.76 & 4188433.34 & 1063.60275 & (17011609) & \\
\hline 4188433.341 & 1132.66771 (17 & (17013024) & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188433.34 & 904.57155 & (17120120) & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 717.17859 (171 & (17122320) & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188433.34 & 649.80803 & (17011509) & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188433.34 & 380.09768 (17 & (17122619) & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188433.34 & 205.88998 & (17011303) & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 146.84147 (17 & (17122902) & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4 4188483.34 & 162.03712 & (17122902) & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 185.79418 (17 & (17022506) & & \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188483.34 & 212.58529 & (17022506) & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 238.28995 & (17022506) & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188483.34 & 279.21629 & (17013105) & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 325.02318 (17 & (17013105) & & \\
\hline 650425.76 & 4188483.34 & 1396.25353 & (17122701) & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 1043.07404 (17 & (17012908) & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188483.34 & 908.91975 & (17011509) & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 507.93973 (17 & (17122619) & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188483.34 & 379.78445 & (17020824) & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188483.34 & 210.57493 & (17010504) & & \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188533.34 & 144.46832 & (17121807) & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 164.16964 (17 & (17121807) & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188533.34 & 186.74605 & (17121807) & 649425.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 212.29685 & (17121807) & & \\
\hline 649525.76 & 4188533.34 & 240.61866 & (17121807) & 649625.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 278.93021 (17 & (17022506) & & \\
\hline 649725.76 & 4188533.34 & 337.37955 & (17022506) & 650425.76 \\
\hline 4188533.3418 & 1807.01657 (17 & (17122318) & & \\
\hline 650525.76 & 4188533.34 & 1355.82332 & (17011509) & 650625.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 744.96301 (17 & (17011509) & & \\
\hline 650725.76 & 4188533.34 & 498.13956 & (17011303) & 650825.76 \\
\hline 4188533.34 & 391.76083 (17 & (17121319) & & \\
\hline 651125.76 & 4188533.34 & 227.62096 & (17122519) & 649125.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 148.70752 (17 & (17013008) & & \\
\hline 649225.76 & 4188583.34 & 166.21715 & (17013008) & 649325.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 186.96325 & (17013008) & & \\
\hline 649425.76 & 4188583.34 & 211.74005 & (17013008) & 649525.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 241.57648 (17 & (17013008) & & \\
\hline 649625.76 & 4188583.34 & 277.80344 & (17013008) & 649725.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 329.16967 (17 & (17121807) & & \\
\hline 650425.76 & 4188583.34 & 0.00000 & (00000000) & 650525.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 1260.62293 (17 & (17011509) & & \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188583.34 & 725.96240 & (17121319) & 650725.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 550.79328 (17 & (17122519) & & \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188583.34 & 414.70258 & (17122519) & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188583.34 & 220.19483 (17 & 21) & & \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188633.34 & 155.21764 & (17011505) & 649225.76 \\
\hline 4188633.34 & 172.68951 (17 & 05) & & \\
\hline 649325.76 & 4188633.34 & 193.74731 & (17011505) & 649425.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

4188633.34 219.55772 (17011505)
649525.76 4188633.34 251.78242 (17011505) 649625.76
4188633.34 292.89780 (17011505)
649725.76 4188633.34 346.77514 (17011505) 649825.76
4188633.34 419.76900 (17011505)
649925.76 4188633.34 522.98698 (17011505) 650025.76
4188633.34 677.52814 (17011505)
650125.76 4188633.34 928.30124 (17011505) 650225.76
4188633.34 1398.75027 (17121203)
650325.76 4188633.34 0.00000 (00000000) 650425.76
4188633.34 0.00000 (00000000)
650525.76 4188633.34 1334.00590 (14022208) 650625.76
4188633.34 817.61411 (14022208)
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*** THE 1ST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL4
***
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL4 ,
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS

|  |  | ** CONC OF OTHER |  | IN MICROGRAMS/M**3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X-COORD (M) | Y-COORD (M) | CONC | (YYMMDDHH) |  | X-COORD (M) |
| Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4188633.34 418.82287 (14022208) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188633.34 | 223.38464 | (16010203) |  | 649125.76 |
| 4188683.34 (17013107) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 649225.76 | 4188683.34 | 171.23998 | (17013107) |  | 649325.76 |
| 4188683.34 193.09269 (17013107) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 649425.76 | 4188683.34 | 219.39162 | (17013107) |  | 649525.76 |
| 4188683.34 251.36145 (17013107) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 649625.76 | -4188683.34 | 290.64865 | (17013107) |  | 649725.76 |
| 4188683.34 339.47393 (17013107) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 649825.76 | 4188683.34 | 412.89166 | (17122903) |  | 649925.76 |
| 4188683.34 519.87952 (17121322) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650025.76 | 4188683.34 | 678.14670 | (17121322) |  | 650125.76 |
| 4188683.34 882.46798 (17121322) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650225.76 | 4188683.34 | 1380.60512 | (17011201) |  | 650325.76 |

```

```

4188833.34 265.64636 (17122608)
649725.76 4188833.34 322.31285 (17011201) 649825.76
4188833.34 384.28132 (17120707)
649925.76 4188833.34 479.67709 (17020404) 650025.76
4188833.34 525.89110 (17121402)
650125.76 4188833.34 573.37883 (17120208) 650225.76
4188833.34 782.36404 (17122909)
650325.76 4188833.34 1006.29178 (17012717) 650425.76
4188833.34 998.52377 (17012905)
650525.76 4188833.34 849.59736 (17022706) 650625.76
4188833.34 645.00737 (17022407)
650725.76 4188833.34 483.52401 (17121119) 650825.76
4188833.34 382.28058 (13020908)
651125.76 4188833.34 218.91368 (15122617) 649125.76
4188883.34 132.70768 (17013104)
**** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
*** AERMET - VERSION 18081 *** ***
16:20:52
PAGE 61
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VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL4
*** THE 1ST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL4


```
4188883.34 738.99480 (17021405)
    650625.76 4188883.34 568.62125 (17122321) 650725.76
4188883.34 469.99341 (17123020)
    650825.76 4188883.34 361.31578 (13121617) 651125.76
4188883.34 212.08622 (15010317)
    650125.76 4188933.34 495.83390 (17122909) 650225.76
4188933.34 587.09363 (17022607)
    650325.76 4188933.34 686.46299 (17012717) 650425.76
4188933.34 669.05639 (17012905)
    650525.76 4188933.34 598.03730 (17122223) 650625.76
4188933.34 531.71376 (17012601)
    650725.76 4188933.34 447.13457 (17022407) 650825.76
4188933.34 368.92287 (17121119)
    651125.76 4188933.34 209.75412 (14011317) 650425.76
4188983.34 545.32815 (17012905)
    650525.76 4188983.34 565.27396 (17022508) 650625.76
4188983.34 479.03030 (17022706)
    650725.76 4188983.34 384.73991 (17022408) 650825.76
4188983.34 318.10194 (17022407)
    651125.76 4188983.34 202.11275 (14022307) 650525.76
4189033.34 501.26104 (17022508)
    650625.76 4189033.34 437.82060 (17021405) 650725.76
4189033.34 376.04856 (17122321)
    650825.76 4189033.34 326.73671 (17022407) 651125.76
4189033.34 196.12423 (17120617)
    650525.76 4189083.34 419.44209 (17022508) 650625.76
4189083.34 380.35525 (17021405)
    650725.76 4189083.34 351.68416 (17012601) 650825.76
4189083.34 286.64459 (17022408)
    651125.76 4189083.34 193.89026 (17121119) 650525.76
4189133.34 375.54481 (17121401)
    650625.76 4189133.34 328.26892 (17122223) 650725.76
4189133.34 316.98608 (17022706)
    650825.76 4189133.34 287.25441 (17122321) 651125.76
4189133.34 196.46538 (17121119)
    650781.98 4189510.65 166.47668 (17122223) 650760.33
4189397.50 194.58059 (17121904)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL5
*** THE 1 ST HIGHEST 1 -HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL5,
** CONC OF OTHER
**
X-COORD (M)
Y-COORD
Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH) X-COORD (M)

IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 649676.34 & & 423.05774 & (13010908) & 649629.66 \\
\hline 4188294.84 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 649810.15 & 4188312.48 & 535.64538 & (16010309) & 649364.10 \\
\hline 4188360.20 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{290.61312 (17021308)} \\
\hline 649327.80 & 4188355.01 & 275.31484 & (17021308) & 649380.70 \\
\hline 4188758.52 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{293.25637 (17120702)} \\
\hline 650495.81 & 4188841.51 & 417.38901 & (13121617) & 650597.4 \\
\hline 4188832.17 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{342.21323 (14011317)} \\
\hline 650536.27 & 4188878.85 & 363.55279 & (13121617) & 650577. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(4188877.81 \quad 334.87511\) (13121617) \(650602.66 \quad 4188860.18 \quad 324.15412\) (13020908) 650610.95
\(4188880.93 \quad 312.93933\) (14022307) \(650638.10 \quad 4188858.53 \quad 306.27688\) (13020908) 650664.10
\(4188331.03 \quad 331.41206 \quad(17011509)\) \(650668.724188350 .83 \quad 281.47680\) (17011509) 650677.96
\(4188379.86 \quad 277.77204 \quad(17122619)\) \(\begin{array}{lllll}650699.74 & 4188414.84 & 266.90230 & (17020824) & 650758.47\end{array}\)
\(4188658.36 \quad 280.15492\) (14022208) \(650765.73 \quad 4188678.82 \quad 273.30505\) (14022208)
650773.65
\(4188706.54 \quad 254.83784 \quad\) (14021603)
\(650778.27 \quad 4188726.34 \quad 251.17118\) (15122424) 650805.33
\(4188805.53 \quad 235.54111\) (15122617)
\(650806.65 \quad 4188824.01 \quad 230.28096\) (13020204) 650811.27
\(4188843.81 \quad 230.32998\) (15010317)
\(650814.57 \quad 4188862.29 \quad 226.19534\) (15010317) 650846.24
\(4188924.98 \quad 209.17931\) (14011317)
\(650850.864188951 .38 \quad 203.08959\) (13020908) 650854.82
\(4188976.46 \quad 197.07935 \quad\) (14022307)
\(650698.004188307 .32 \quad 315.99650\) (17011509) 650692.60
\(4188291.80 \quad 339.45866\) (17011509)
\(650724.824189245 .80 \quad 189.72508\) (17120205) 650726.07
\(4189273.37 \quad 186.79814\) (17022408)
\(650856.27 \quad 4189006.30 \quad 190.63691\) (14022307)
650857.23
\(4189022.60 \quad 190.19772\) (17120617)
\(650859.154189041 .29 \quad 189.56766\) (17120617) 650859.15
\(4189058.54 \quad 184.20097\) (14012706)
\(650860.58 \quad 4189076.28 \quad 183.57926\) (14012706) 650861.54
\(4189094.49 \quad 186.83868\) (17121119)
\(650857.714189113 .19 \quad 194.13366\) (17121119) 650847.16
\(4189118.94 \quad 197.68962\) (17121119)
\(650848.124189134 .76 \quad 193.94816\) (17121119)
650850.04
```

    4189155.37 190.05293 (17123020)
    650851.48 4189171.66 187.22574 (17123020) 650853.87
    4189184.12 182.57263 (17123020)
650856.75 4189199.46 174.63609 (17123020) 650857.71
4189213.36 165.20994 (17123020)
650860.58 4189226.30 158.65009 (13121217) 650862.50
4189242.60 160.74090 (17120122)
650865.38 4189258.42 164.16057 (17022407) 650867.77
4189275.19 167.86953 (17022407)
650868.73 4189291.49 169.52409 (17022407) 650872.09
4189309.23 167.90786 (17022407)
650874.00 4189325.04 164.56834 (17022407) 650875.92
4189340.38 159.51839 (17022407) (17) (17022407) ()
650878.80 4189355.24 153.36125 (17022407) 650881.19
4189373.45 146.14889 (14011617)
650884.55 4189390.71 143.88729 (17120205)
4189407.01 141.59199 (17120205)
650889.82 4189427.14 138.42096 (17022408) 650891.74
4189443.43 138.95353 (17022408)
650895.09 4189461.17 137.64491 (17022408)
4189475.55 135.51718 (17022408)
650898.45 4189489.93 137.31768 (17122321) 650902.28
4189504.31 137.34611 (17122321)
650709.41 4188344.56 257.10822 (17122619) 650722.45
4188284.03 311.99032 (17011509)
650745.73 4188280.30 287.87142 (17011509) 650735.49
4188223.50 304.75067 (17011509)
650721.52 4188167.62 266.40841 (17121219) 650525.76
4188133.34 324.29716 (17012908)
651125.76 4188133.34 127.20889 (17122619) 649125.76
4188183.34 186.34212 (17021420)
649225.76 4188183.34 209.48657 (17121504) 649325.76
4188183.34 236.86486 (17120517)
649425.76 4188183.34 250.51304 (17123107) 649525.76
4188183.34 287.02305 (14120608)
649625.76 4188183.34 332.79065 (13013108) 649725.76
4188183.34 370.68878 (15122802)
649825.76 4188183.34 418.54326 (17121508) 649925.76
4188183.34 461.84594 (17122918)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL5
INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL5

```
** CONC OF OTHER
**
X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH) X-COORD (M) Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH)
\(650025.764188183 .34 \quad 561.98266\) (17011609) 650125.76
\(4188183.34 \quad 515.02338\) (15011509) \(650225.764188183 .34 \quad 516.34212\) (17122701) 650325.76
\(4188183.34 \quad 456.96489\) (17012903) \(650425.764188183 .34 \quad 384.13462\) (17120120) 650525.76
\(4188183.34 \quad 328.67274\) (17012908) \(650625.76 \quad 4188183.34 \quad 303.39139\) (17122320) 650725.76
\(4188183.34 \quad 265.87577\) (17121219) \(650825.76 \quad 4188183.34 \quad 267.10771\) (17011509) 651125.76
\(4188183.34 \quad 135.83148\) (17122619) \(649125.76 \quad 4188233.34 \quad 191.93122\) (17120203) 649225.76
\(4188233.34 \quad 216.00516\) (17021420) \(649325.76 \quad 4188233.34 \quad 244.77048\) (17121504) 649425.76
\(4188233.34 \quad 276.59923\) (17120517) \(649525.76 \quad 4188233.34 \quad 300.92293\) (13012121) 649625.76
4188233.34349 .48033 (13010906) \(649725.76 \quad 4188233.34 \quad 404.73915\) (16010309) 649825.76
\(4188233.34 \quad 460.15527\) (14021122)
\(649925.764188233 .34 \quad 532.32626\) (17122918) 650025.76
\(4188233.34 \quad 634.12433\) (17011609)
\(650125.764188233 .34 \quad 583.67218\) (15011509) 650225.76
\(4188233.34 \quad 566.77545 \quad(17012804)\)
\(650325.76 \quad 4188233.34 \quad 521.82765\) (17020801) 650425.76
\(4188233.34 \quad 418.72554\) (17012908)
\(\begin{array}{lllll}650525.76 & 4188233.34 & 328.15450 & \text { (17122320) } & 650625.76\end{array}\)
\(4188233.34 \quad 322.48149\) (17121219)
\(650725.764188233 .34 \quad 313.82316\) (17011509) 650825.76
\(4188233.34 \quad 250.84233\) (17011509)
\(651125.764188233 .34 \quad 133.62091\) (17020824) 649125.76
\(4188283.34 \quad 204.53866 \quad(17021308)\)
\(\begin{array}{lllll}649225.76 & 4188283.34 & 218.42647 & (17021308) & 649325.76\end{array}\)
\(4188283.34 \quad 253.84456 \quad(17021420)\)
\(649425.764188283 .34 \quad 291.13159\) (17121504) 649525.76
\(4188283.34 \quad 325.66914\) (17120517)
\(649625.76 \quad 4188283.34 \quad 373.70837\) (13010908) 649725.76
\(4188283.34 \quad 444.60821\) (13013108)
\(649825.764188283 .34 \quad 509.48521\) (15010507) 649925.76
\(4188283.34 \quad 601.54715\) (17123007)
\(650025.76 \quad 4188283.34 \quad 712.34494 \quad\) (17011609)
650125.76
```

    4188283.34 688.25586 (17122917)
    650225.76 4188283.34 665.19354 (17122620) 650325.76
    4188283.34 547.79892 (17120120)
650425.76 4188283.34 452.28846 (17012908) 650525.76
4188283.34 398.63902 (17122320)
650625.76 4188283.34 370.54077 (17011509) 650725.76
4188283.34 308.76709 (17011509)
650825.76 4188283.34 203.54158 (17122619) 651125.76
4188283.34 133.21476 (17020824)
649125.76 4188333.34 201.51223 (17123023)
649225.76
4188333.34 232.84158 (17021308)
649325.76 4188333.34 265.43544 (17021308)
649425.76
4188333.34 303.25549 (17021420)
649525.76 4188333.34 354.06947 (17121504)
4188333.34 394.62155 (15010907)
649725.76 4188333.34 475.35924 (13022803)
649825.76
4188333.34 576.52305 (16010309)
649925.76 4188333.34 650.74667 (17121508) 650025.76
4188333.34 793.97258 (17011609)
650125.76 4188333.34 833.74710 (17122917) 650225.76
4188333.34 752.26600 (17122920)
650325.76 4188333.34 572.65747 (17011508) 650425.76
4188333.34 482.84719 (17122320)
650525.76 4188333.34 437.83542 (17011509) 650625.76
4188333.34 389.09170 (17011509)
650725.76 4188333.34 246.77051 (17122619)
650825.76
4188333.34 207.67091 (17121906)
651125.76 4188333.34 137.45499 (17011303) 649125.76
4188383.34 202.39022 (17012823)
649225.76 4188383.34 228.49730 (17123023) 649325.76
4188383.34 264.21511 (17123023)
649425.76 4188383.34 324.20759 (17021308) 649525.76
4188383.34 369.55427 (17021420)
649625.76 4188383.34 443.16373 (17121504) 649725.76
4188383.34 506.23006 (13012121)
649825.76 4188383.34 637.14254 (13013108) 649925.76
4188383.34 765.51231 (13020205)
650025.76 4188383.34 889.25916 (15012509) 650125.76
4188383.34 1010.93027 (17122917)
650225.76 4188383.34 861.11700 (17020801) 650325.76
4188383.34 670.72093 (17012908)
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    *** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
X-COORD (M) & Y-COORD (M) CONC \\
(YYMMDDHH) & X-COORD (M)
\end{tabular}
\(650425.764188383 .34 \quad 551.92005\) (17121219) 650525.76
\(4188383.34 \quad 504.78791\) (17011509)
\(\begin{array}{lllll}650625.76 & 4188383.34 & 306.98483 & \text { (17122619) } & 650725.76\end{array}\)
\(4188383.34 \quad 249.66946\) (17121906)
\(650825.764188383 .34 \quad 207.94354\) (17020824) 651125.76
\(4188383.34 \quad 141.32209\) (17121319)
\(649125.764188433 .34 \quad 207.31782\) (17013105) 649225.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 234.47941 \quad(17013105)\)
\(649325.764188433 .34 \quad 269.86058\) (17121207) 649425.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 319.16370 \quad\) (17123023)
\(649525.764188433 .34 \quad 396.22042\) (17021308) 649625.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 464.63160 \quad\) (17120203)
\(649725.764188433 .34 \quad 576.46956\) (17121504) 649825.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 694.71651\) (13010908)
\(649925.764188433 .34 \quad 902.71064\) (16010309) 650025.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 1080.14125\) (14021105)
\(650125.76 \quad 4188433.34 \quad 1222.58865\) (17122917) 650225.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 962.23703\) (17011208)
\(650325.764188433 .34 \quad 753.08155\) (17122320) 650425.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 679.52318 \quad\) (17011509)
\(650525.764188433 .34 \quad 394.95661\) (17122619) 650625.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 310.75715\) (17020824) \(650725.76 \quad 4188433.34 \quad 246.69402\) (17011303) 650825.76
\(4188433.34 \quad 210.08085\) (17011303)
\(651125.764188433 .34 \quad 141.03658\) (17010504) 649125.76
\(4188483.34 \quad 210.84598\) (17022506)
\(649225.764188483 .34 \quad 239.83848\) (17022506) 649325.76
\(4188483.34 \quad 273.56116\) (17013105)
\(649425.76 \quad 4188483.34 \quad 327.01355\) (17013105) 649525.76
\(4188483.34 \quad 387.60909\) (17121207)
\(649625.764188483 .34 \quad 479.84522\) (17021308) 649725.76
\(4188483.34 \quad 624.09951\) (17021308)
\(650425.764188483 .34 \quad 532.02679\) (17122619) 650525.76
\(4188483.34 \quad 393.09119\) (17020824)
\(650625.764188483 .34 \quad 310.49066\) (17011303) 650725.76
\(4188483.34 \quad 261.65286\) (17121319) \(650825.76 \quad 4188483.34 \quad 216.56204\) (17010504)
651125.76
```

    4188483.34 150.95826 (17122519)
        649125.76 4188533.34 210.67191 (17121807) 649225.76
    4188533.34 240.94828 (17121807)
649325.76 4188533.34 274.32843 (17121807) 649425.76
4188533.34 332.68063 (17022506)
649525.76 4188533.34 401.24911 (17022506) 649625.76
4188533.34 497.52903 (17013105)
649725.76 4188533.34 626.64530 (17121823) 650425.76
4188533.34 523.54613 (17011303)
650525.76 4188533.34 406.89382 (17121319) 650625.76
4188533.34 323.29328 (17122519)
650725.76 4188533.34 276.84779 (17122519) 650825.76
4188533.34 232.68036 (17122519)
651125.76 4188533.34 146.71894 (17122719) 649125.76
4188583.34 210.25702 (17013008)
649225.76 4188583.34 240.93808 (17013008) 649325.76
4188583.34 278.65031 (17013008)
649425.76 4188583.34 325.52956 (17013008) 649525.76
4188583.34 398.27885 (17121807)
649625.76 4188583.34 504.19482 (17121807) 649725.76
4188583.34 646.89037 (17022506)
650425.76 4188583.34 578.96762 (17122519) 650525.76
4188583.34 425.50839 (17122519)
650625.76 4188583.34 330.95556 (17122719) 650725.76
4188583.34 269.53138 (17122621)
650825.76 4188583.34 226.95621 (17122621) 651125.76
4188583.34 146.61293 (17122621)
649125.76 4188633.34 217.92283 (17011505) 649225.76
4188633.34 249.77207 (17011505)
649325.76 4188633.34 290.37339 (17011505) 649425.76
4188633.34 343.51967 (17011505)
649525.76 4188633.34 415.42205 (17011505) 649625.76
4188633.34 516.89821 (17011505)
649725.76 4188633.34 668.37728 (17011505) 649825.76
4188633.34 912.91931 (17011505)
649925.76 4188633.34 1381.87066 (17121203) 650025.76
4188633.34 0.00000 (00000000)
650125.76 4188633.34 0.00000 (00000000) 650225.76
4188633.34 1474.50166 (14022208)
650325.76 4188633.34 889.49231 (14022208) 650425.76
4188633.34 607.98857 (14022208)
650525.76 4188633.34 447.49740 (14022208) 650625.76
4188633.34 346.10193 (14022208)
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4188733.34 562.83891 (15010317)
    650525.76 4188733.34 426.45737 (13032807) 650625.76
4188733.34 338.09532 (14010519)
    650725.76 4188733.34 272.36131 (14021120) 650825.76
4188733.34 231.17229 (15122424)
    651125.76 4188733.34 148.61503 (15020206) 649125.76
4188783.34 207.59241 (17120702)
        649225.76 4188783.34 232.06341 (17120702)
4188783.34 249.71285 (17120702)
        649425.76 4188783.34 313.53469 (17122608) 649525.76
4188783.34 376.96889 (17122608)
        649625.76 4188783.34 489.09928 (17011201)
4188783.34 616.72941 (17121007)
        649825.76 4188783.34 711.65535 (17121402)
4188783.34 854.82630 (17123024)
        650025.76 4188783.34 1203.14556 (17120219)
4188783.34 1282.26247 (17012905)
        650225.76 4188783.34 1013.31554 (17122321)
4188783.34 759.15994 (17121119)
        650425.76 4188783.34 528.15212 (13020908)
4188783.34 412.03886 (14011317)
        650625.76 4188783.34 330.19963 (13020204)
4188783.34 272.16670 (15122617)
        650825.76 4188783.34 226.91926 (14010519) 651125.76
4188783.34 148.91750 (15122424)
        649125.76 4188833.34 186.08432 (17122608)
4188833.34 226.30160 (17122608)
        649325.76 4188833.34 261.56876 (17122608)
4188833.34 320.02301 (17011201)
        649525.76 4188833.34 380.37048 (17120707)
4188833.34 473.04864 (17020404)
        649725.76 4188833.34 514.92046 (17121402)
4188833.34 561.91812 (17120208)
        649925.76 4188833.34 773.09694 (17122909) 650025.76
4188833.34 934.44631 (17012717)
        650125.76 4188833.34 1010.79662 (17012905) 650225.76
4188833.34 870.71200 (17022706)
        650325.76 4188833.34 681.91429 (17022407)
4188833.34 522.23751 (17121119)
        650525.76 4188833.34 391.01512 (14022307) 650625.76
4188833.34 323.90006 (14011317)
        650725.76 4188833.34 266.40132 (15010317) 650825.76
4188833.34 223.60913 (13020204)
        651125.76 4188833.34 148.00385 (14010519) 649125.76
4188883.34 195.36552 (17122608)
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| *** MODELOPTs: | NondFaul CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U* |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VALUES FOR SOURCE | *** THE 1ST H |  | GHEST 1-HR | average | CONCENTRATION |
|  | GROUP: VOL5 | *** |  |  |  |
|  |  | INCLUDING | URCE (S) : | VOL5 | , |
| *** ${ }^{* * *}$ DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ** ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X-COORD (M) | Y-COORD (M) | CONC | (YYMMDDHH) |  | X-COORD (M) |
| Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH) |  |  |  |  |  |
| - - - - - - - - - - - - - - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 649225.76 | 4188883.34 | 224.69546 | (17011201) |  | 649325.76 |
| 4188883.34 270.33729 (17011201) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 649425.76 | 4188883.34 | 312.23308 | (17121007) |  | 649525.76 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 649625.76 | 4188883.34 | 395.41013 | (17121402) |  | 649725.76 |
| 4188883.34 407.08480 (17120624) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 649825.76 | 4188883.34 | 495.82258 | (17123024) |  | 649925.76 |
| 4188883.34 635.70017 (17122724) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650025.76 | 4188883.34 | 808.89270 | (17012717) |  | 650125.76 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650225.76 | 4188883.34 | 726.30199 | (17021405) |  | 650325.76 |
| 4188883.34 607.22837 (17122321) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650425.76 | 4188883.34 | 468.43653 | (17123020) |  | 650525.76 |
| 4188883.34 374.52028 (17121119) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650625.76 | 4188883.34 | 304.99169 | (14022307) |  | 650725.76 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650825.76 | 4188883.34 | 216.76870 | (13121420) |  | 651125.76 |
| 4188883.34 147.14682 (15122617) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650125.76 | 4188933.34 | 631.89562 | (17012720) |  | 650225.76 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650325.76 | 4188933.34 | 551.01878 | (17012601) |  | 650425.76 |
| $4188933.34 \quad 452.95579$ (17022407) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650525.76 | 4188933.34 | 372.32212 | (17123020) |  | 650625.76 |
| 4188933.34 290.54674 (14012706) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650725.76 | 4188933.34 | 246.38008 | (14022307) |  | 650825.76 |
| 4188933.34 211.98151 (13020908) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188933.34 | 144.70091 | (15010317) |  | 650425.76 |
| 4188983.34 410.64467 (17122321) ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650525.76 | 4188983.34 | 342.83436 | (17022407) |  | 650625.76 |
| 4188983.34 301.41469 (17121119) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 650725.76 | 4188983.34 | 235.46217 | (13121617) |  | 650825.76 |
| 4188983.34 | 204.36086 (14 | 307) |  |  |  |
| 651125.76 | 4188983.34 | 139.78796 | (13121420) |  | 650525.76 |

```
4189033.34 322.81754 (17022407)
    650625.76 4189033.34 269.07678 (17123020) 650725.76
4189033.34 246.80437 (17121119)
    650825.76 4189033.34 197.75552 (17120617) 651125.76
4189033.34 138.84812 (14011317)
    650525.76 4189083.34 298.97338 (17122321) 650625.76
4189083.34 271.26036 (17022407)
    650725.76 4189083.34 234.18516 (17123020) 650825.76
4189083.34 202.96646 (17121119)
    651125.76 4189083.34 134.29701 (13020908)
4189133.34 286.71783 (17122321)
    650625.76 4189133.34 241.86934 (17022407) 650725.76
4189133.34 206.24419 (17120122)
    650825.76 4189133.34 197.89248 (17123020) 651125.76
4189133.34 129.99596 (14022307)
    650781.98 4189510.65 152.12241 (17012601) 650760.33
4189397.50 168.98267 (17122321)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL6
                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL6
*** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|r|}{** ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3} \\
\hline X-COORD (M) & Y-COORD (M) & CONC & (YYMMDDHH) & & X-COORD (M) \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -} \\
\hline 649676.34 & 4188314.55 & 526.86595 & (17121823) & & 649629.66 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{4188294.84 470.16256 (17123023)} \\
\hline 649810.15 & 4188312.48 & 762.30349 & (17021308) & & 649364.10 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{4188360.20 292.42020 (17121807)} \\
\hline 649327.80 & 4188355.01 & 275.96379 & (17121807) & & 649380.70 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{4188758.52 277.45517 (17020404)} \\
\hline 650495.81 & 4188841.51 & 324.01888 & (17122321) & & 650597.47 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{4188832.17 279.93156 (17022407)} \\
\hline 650536.27 & 4188878.85 & 289.32376 & (17022408) & & 650577.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{4188877.81 283.05301 (17022407)} \\
\hline 650602.66 & 4188860.18 & 286.66111 & (17022407) & & 650610.95 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

```
4188880.93 279.33655 (17022407)
    650638.10 4188858.53 248.75061 (17022407)
4188331.03 296.90426 (17122519)
    650668.72 4188350.83 311.35862 (17122519) 650677.96
4188379.86 296.90356 (17122719)
    650699.74 4188414.84 285.25345 (17122621)
4188658.36 244.78276 (13121420)
    650765.73 4188678.82 242.55653 (14011317) 650773.65
4188706.54 235.06706 (14011317)
    650778.27 4188726.34 230.13312 (13020908)
4188805.53 208.91643 (13121617)
    650806.65 4188824.01 204.38417 (13121617)
4188843.81 200.56815 (14012706)
    650814.57 4188862.29 201.74745 (17121119)
4188924.98 197.11167 (17121119)
    650850.86 4188951.38 189.90645 (17123020)
4188976.46 185.21662 (17123020)
    650698.00 4188307.32 272.97817 (17121319)
4188291.80 277.35826 (17121319)
    650724.82 4189245.80 168.56898 (17012601)
4189273.37 160.39338 (17012601)
    650856.27 4189006.30 169.42117 (17123020)
4189022.60 159.83821 (13121217)
    650859.15 4189041.29 162.89900 (17120122)
4189058.54 168.88945 (17022407)
    650860.58 4189076.28 171.78757 (17022407)
4189094.49 171.58515 (17022407)
    650857.71 4189113.19 167.95391 (17022407)
4189118.94 164.74999 (17022407)
    650848.12 4189134.76 156.41918 (17022407)
4189155.37 152.46079 (17120205)
    650851.48 4189171.66 150.00396 (17120205)
4189184.12 146.85043 (17120205)
    650856.75 4189199.46 147.39241 (17022408)
4189213.36 147.13362 (17022408)
    650860.58 4189226.30 145.49285 (17022408)
4189242.60 145.62114 (17122321)
    650865.38 4189258.42 146.35361 (17122321)
4189275.19 146.08223 (17122321)
    650868.73 4189291.49 144.72588 (17122321) 650872.09
4189309.23 141.64798 (17122321)
    650874.00 4189325.04 137.94240 (17122321)
650875.92
650881.19
650888.86
650891.74
4189443.43 126.19896 (17012601)
    650895.09 4189461.17 124.23844 (17012601)
650898.45
```

```
4189475.55 122.18737 (17012601)
    650898.45 4189489.93 119.63153 (17012601) 650902.28
4189504.31 116.89380 (17012601)
    650709.41 4188344.56 286.89985 (17122519) 650722.45
4188284.03 261.50509 (17121319)
    650745.73 4188280.30 250.87863 (17121319) 650735.49
4188223.50 242.29059 (17020824)
    650721.52 4188167.62 254.39198 (17122619) 650525.76
4188133.34 416.65305 (17121219)
    651125.76 4188133.34 136.99285 (17011303) 649125.76
4188183.34 198.42041 (17121207)
    649225.76 4188183.34 224.55561 (17123023) 649325.76
4188183.34 257.43884 (17123023)
    649425.76 4188183.34 315.85826 (17021308) 649525.76
4188183.34 358.81862 (17021420)
    649625.76 4188183.34 428.10957 (17121504) 649725.76
4188183.34 486.23950 (13012121)
    649825.76 4188183.34 606.66705 (13013108) 649925.76
4188183.34 728.35215 (13012423)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL6
                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL6
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
                                    ** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
```



```
4188183.34 140.35365 (17121319)
    649125.76 4188233.34 203.83217 (17013105) 649225.76
4188233.34 228.84309 (17013105)
    649325.76 4188233.34 263.96179 (17121207) 649425.76
4188233.34 311.07759 (17123023)
    649525.76 4188233.34 385.27152 (17021308)
4188233.34 448.28934 (17120203)
    649725.76 4188233.34 552.78117 (17121504)
4188233.34 662.54462 (15011205)
    649925.76 4188233.34 861.66321 (16010309)
4188233.34 1021.53790 (14021105)
    650125.76 4188233.34 1170.61312 (17122917)
4188233.34 948.89029 (17020801)
    650325.76 4188233.34 722.86618 (17122320)
4188233.34 672.54481 (17011509)
    650525.76 4188233.34 404.17581 (17011509)
4188233.34 307.45727 (17121906)
    650725.76 4188233.34 241.74764 (17011303)
4188233.34 211.20903 (17011303)
    651125.76 4188233.34 140.96090 (17010504)
4188283.34 207.23062 (17022506)
    649225.76 4188283.34 234.09424 (17022506)
4188283.34 268.54101 (17013105)
    649425.76 4188283.34 317.57992 (17013105)
4188283.34 375.91880 (17121207)
        649625.76 4188283.34 466.48770 (17021308)
4188283.34 596.81140 (17021308)
        649825.76 4188283.34 751.62591 (17121504)
4188283.34 956.55072 (13013108)
        650025.76 4188283.34 1269.65157 (13011517)
4188283.34 1441.37882 (17122917)
        650225.76 4188283.34 1085.84827 (17012908)
4188283.34 928.21026 (17011509)
        650425.76 4188283.34 564.23882 (17011509)
4188283.34 394.61264 (17020824)
        650625.76 4188283.34 309.95917 (17011303)
4188283.34 259.90068 (17121319)
        650825.76 4188283.34 214.84897 (17010504)
4188283.34 150.63254 (17122519)
    649125.76 4188333.34 206.99832 (17121807)
4188333.34 235.33363 (17121807)
        649325.76 4188333.34 266.95497 (17022506)
4188333.34 324.90033 (17022506)
        649525.76 4188333.34 387.30968 (17022506)
649625.76
4188333.34 479.71563 (17011605)
    649725.76 4188333.34 601.77431 (17121823)
649825.76
4188333.34 855.04920 (17021308)
    649925.76 4188333.34 1106.86532 (17121504) 650025.76
4188333.34 1612.72680 (16010309)
    650125.76 4188333.34 1803.50298 (17122318)
650225.76
```

```
    4188333.34 1356.36485 (17011509)
    650325.76 4188333.34 853.50283 (17011509) 650425.76
    4188333.34 515.32563 (17011303)
    650525.76 4188333.34 404.55303 (17121319) 650625.76
    4188333.34 317.02310 (17010504)
    650725.76 4188333.34 274.07223 (17122519) 650825.76
    4188333.34 232.89797 (17122519)
    651125.76 4188333.34 147.25737 (17122719) 649125.76
    4188383.34 206.40754 (17013008)
    649225.76 4188383.34 235.43193 (17013008) 649325.76
    4188383.34 270.74835 (17013008)
    649425.76 4188383.34 314.11709 (17013008) 649525.76
    4188383.34 388.85406 (17121807)
    649625.76 4188383.34 486.07474 (17121807) 649725.76
    4188383.34 623.60905 (17022506)
    649825.76 4188383.34 844.01210 (17011605) 649925.76
    4188383.34 1274.18779 (17021308)
    650025.76 4188383.34 1977.18736 (16122205) 650125.76
    4188383.34 0.00000 (00000000)
    650225.76 4188383.34 1470.47430 (17011509) 650325.76
    4188383.34 765.39172 (17121319)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL6
                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL6 ,
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
***
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline X-COORD (M) & Y-COORD (M) & CONC & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{(YYMMDDHH)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{X-COORD (M)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Y-COORD (M) CONC (YYMMDDHH)}} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{\[
\begin{array}{lllll}
650425.76 & 4188383.34 & 573.51491 & (17122519) & 650525.76
\end{array}
\]} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{188383.34 429.47318 (17122519)} \\
\hline 650625.76 & 4188383.34 & 331.89759 & (17122719) & 650725.76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{83.34 267.15935 (17122621)} \\
\hline 650825.76 & 4188383.34 & 225.91751 & (17122621) & 651125.76 \\
\hline 4188383.34 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{147.05378 (17122621)} \\
\hline 649125.76 & 4188433.34 & 214.00654 & (17011505) & 649225.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

```
4188433.34 244.76610 (17011505)
    649325.76 4188433.34 283.81717 (17011505) 649425.76
4188433.34 334.67637 (17011505)
    649525.76 4188433.34 403.05265 (17011505) 649625.76
4188433.34 498.78639 (17011505)
    649725.76 4188433.34 640.23454 (17011505)
4188433.34 865.54999 (17011505)
    649925.76 4188433.34 1278.96585 (17121203)
4188433.34 0.00000 (00000000)
    650125.76 4188433.34 0.00000 (00000000)
4188433.34 1461.06746 (14022208)
    650325.76 4188433.34 876.11949 (14022208)
4188433.34 598.17962 (14022208)
    650525.76 4188433.34 440.33685 (14022208)
4188433.34 340.71614 (14022208)
    650725.76 4188433.34 275.44822 (16010203)
4188433.34 229.63341 (16010203)
    651125.76 4188433.34 147.93883 (16010203)
4188483.34 213.79986 (17013107)
    649225.76 4188483.34 244.10735 (17013107)
4188483.34 281.10577 (17013107)
    649425.76 4188483.34 327.03997 (17122903)
4188483.34 396.18174 (17122903)
    649625.76 4188483.34 495.42906 (17121322)
4188483.34 640.30371 (17121322)
    650425.76 4188483.34 575.24934 (14021120)
4188483.34 436.91926 (14021603)
    650625.76 4188483.34 349.79611 (14022208)
4188483.34 291.73079 (14022208)
    650825.76 4188483.34 246.94487 (14022208)
4188483.34 160.96939 (14022208)
    649125.76 4188533.34 208.61716 (17011121) 649225.76
4188533.34 241.96151 (17121322)
    649325.76 4188533.34 280.88550 (17121322)
649425.76
649625.76
650425.76
650625.76
650825.76
649125.76
649325.76
649525.76
649725.76
```

```
4188583.34 597.12480 (17121007)
    650425.76 4188583.34 529.46395 (13020908) 650525.76
4188583.34 412.03136 (14011317)
    650625.76 4188583.34 330.05703 (13020204) 650725.76
4188583.34 271.58526 (15122617)
    650825.76 4188583.34 227.70220 (14010519) 651125.76
4188583.34 149.29533 (15122424)
    649125.76 4188633.34 179.83055 (17122608) 649225.76
4188633.34 220.55856 (17122608)
    649325.76 4188633.34 258.27698 (17122608) 649425.76
4188633.34 308.78941 (17011201)
    649525.76 4188633.34 370.16298 (17011201) 649625.76
4188633.34 455.50306 (17020404)
    649725.76 4188633.34 515.81714 (17121402) 649825.76
4188633.34 549.63547 (17120208)
    649925.76 4188633.34 758.65203 (17122909) 650025.76
4188633.34 907.72941 (17120219)
    650125.76 4188633.34 982.89138 (17012905) 650225.76
4188633.34 867.38804 (17021405)
    650325.76 4188633.34 678.79483 (17022407) 650425.76
4188633.34 523.01925 (17121119)
    650525.76 4188633.34 390.89641 (14022307) 650625.76
4188633.34 324.52741 (14011317)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
                                *** THE 1ST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL6
                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL6
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
```




```
4188783.34 344.86213 (17022407)
    650625.76 4188783.34 301.30249 (17121119) 650725.76
4188783.34 235.90432 (13121617)
    650825.76 4188783.34 204.68994 (14022307) 651125.76
4188783.34 139.97524 (13121420)
    649125.76 4188833.34 193.84835 (17121007) 649225.76
4188833.34 216.21609 (17020404)
    649325.76 4188833.34 220.37696 (17121402) 649425.76
4188833.34 234.26359 (17043004)
    649525.76 4188833.34 232.04901 (17121808) 649625.76
4188833.34 274.24422 (17123024)
    649725.76 4188833.34 325.10812 (17122909) 649825.76
4188833.34 357.49278 (17122724)
    649925.76 4188833.34 453.96589 (17120219) 650025.76
4188833.34 486.59003 (17012717)
    650125.76 4188833.34 499.80939 (17012720) 650225.76
4188833.34 476.74931 (17022508)
    650325.76 4188833.34 438.84845 (17021405) 650425.76
4188833.34 379.49178 (17012601)
    650525.76 4188833.34 320.27666 (17022407) 650625.76
4188833.34 267.75352 (17123020)
    650725.76 4188833.34 247.18210 (17121119) 650825.76
4188833.34 198.04002 (13121617)
    651125.76 4188833.34 139.25659 (14011317) 649125.76
4188883.34 186.91107 (17020404)
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*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: VOL6
                            *** THE 1ST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION
                                    ***
                                    INCLUDING SOURCE(S): VOL6 ,
                                    *** DISCRETE CARTESIAN RECEPTOR POINTS
```



```
    4188883.34 214.63406 (15022507)
    649625.76 4188883.34 244.74820 (14121304) 649725.76
    4188883.34 302.52844 (17122909)
    649825.76 4188883.34 332.71510 (17122724) 649925.76
    4188883.34 389.84689 (17120219)
    650025.76 4188883.34 410.67993 (17012717)
    4188883.34 442.95268 (17012720)
        650225.76 4188883.34 420.92102 (17121401)
    4188883.34 367.28798 (17121904)
        650425.76 4188883.34 344.59814 (17012601)
    4188883.34 301.56097 (17122321)
        650625.76 4188883.34 271.72961 (17022407)
    4188883.34 233.72947 (17123020)
        650825.76 4188883.34 203
    4188883.34 134.67486 (13020908)
        650125.76 4188933.34 395
    4188933.34 368.76741 (17121401)
        650325.76 4188933.34 334.40930 (17122223)
    4188933.34 312.35474 (17022706)
        650525.76 4188933.34 284.37744 (17122321)
    4188933.34 240.90445 (14011617)
        650725.76 4188933.34 208.29922 (17022407)
    4188933.34 198.07434 (17123020)
        651125.76 4188933.34 130.28706 (14022307)
    4188983.34 302.15306 (17021405)
        650525.76 4188983.34 272.88982 (17012601)
4188983.34 231.37701 (17122321)
        650725.76 4188983.34 217.93598 (17022407) 650825.76
    4188983.34 178.73908 (17123020)
        651125.76 4188983.34 129.28059 (17120617) 650525.76
    4189033.34 247.15412 (17022706)
    650625.76 4189033.34 228.64724 (17122321)
4189033.34 192.15187 (14011617)
    650825.76 4189033.34 179.65832 (17022407) 651125.76
4189033.34 124.87241 (14012706)
    650525.76 4189083.34 225.61242 (17022324) 650625.76
4189083.34 213.66207 (17012601)
    650725.76 4189083.34 186.31971 (17022408) 650825.76
4189083.34 177.85018 (17022407)
    651125.76 4189083.34 131.85465 (17121119) 650525.76
4189133.34 222.29738 (17021405)
    650625.76 4189133.34 203.32459 (17012601) 650725.76
4189133.34 187.67087 (17122321)
    650825.76 4189133.34 158.77302 (17120205) 651125.76
4189133.34 127.31014 (17123020)
    650781.98 4189510.65 121.51151 (17021405) 650760.33
    4189397.50 137.16399 (17022706)
^ *** AERMOD - VERSION 19191 *** *** C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU)\Documents\HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
    *** AERMET - VERSION }1808
```



6TH HIGHEST VALUE IS
10.06 10.06, 0.00) DC 7TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC 8TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC 9TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 10TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC

VOL3 1ST HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC 2ND HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC 3RD HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC 10.06,
10.06,
10.06,
10.06,
10.06,
10.06, 10.06,

VOL4 1ST HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC 2ND HIGHEST VALUE IS
10.06,
10.06,
10.06,
10.06,
10.06,
10.06,
10.06,
10.06, 4TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 5TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 6TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 7TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 8TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 9TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 10TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 10.06, 0.00) DC 3RD HIGHEST VALUE IS $10.06,0.00)$ DC
4TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 4TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 5TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 6TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 7TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 8TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC 9TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC

| 66.40581 | AT | 649725.76, | 4188333.34, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59.35489 | AT ( | 649925.76, | 4188333.34, |
| 57.93812 | AT ( | 649725.76, | 4188533.34, |
| 51.39279 | AT ( | 649825.76, | 4188283.34, |
| 43.87140 | AT ( | 649625.76, | 4188433.34, |
| 134.57865 | AT ( | 649725.76, | 4188683.34, |
| 72.15382 | AT ( | 649925.76, | 4188633.34, |
| 64.67384 | AT ( | 649725.76, | 4188533.34, |
| 59.89342 | AT ( | 649725.76, | 4188733.34, |
| 49.40382 | AT ( | 649825.76, | 4188733.34, |
| 48.35776 | AT ( | 649925.76, | 4188683.34, |
| 43.76064 | AT ( | 649625.76, | 4188633.34, |
| 41.34569 | AT ( | 649625.76, | 4188683.34, |
| 36.17104 | AT ( | 649625.76, | 4188583.34, |
| 35.49091 | AT ( | 649725.76, | 4188483.34, |
| 101.22201 | AT ( | 650425.76, | 4188533.34, |
| 71.15977 | AT ( | 650525.76, | 4188583.34, |
| 70.39500 | AT ( | 650525.76, | 4188633.34, |
| 66.12417 | AT ( | 650325.76, | 4188733.34, |
| 54.95206 | AT ( | 650525.76, | 4188533.34, |
| 54.34743 | AT ( | 650425.76, | 4188733.34, |
| 49.34341 | AT ( | 650525.76, | 4188683.34, |
| 47.22930 | AT ( | 650425.76, | 4188483.34, |
| 45.22354 | AT ( | 650225.76, | 4188633.34, |

10TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 43.67173 AT ( 650225.76, 4188683.34,
10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC
${ }^{*}{ }^{* * *}$ AERMOD - VERSION $19191^{* * *} \quad * * *$ C: \Users $\backslash$ Smith ${ }^{* *}$ Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU) \Documents \HRA\Ashley *** 10/26/23
*** AERMET - VERSION 18081
16:20:52
PAGE 73
*** MODELOPTs: NONDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL ADJ_U*
THE SUMMARY OF MAXIMUM PERIOD ( 43824
HRS) RESULTS ***
** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3

NETWORK
GROUP ID AVERAGE CONC RECEPTOR (XR, YR, ZELEV, ZHILL, ZFLAG) OF TYPE GRID-ID

| VOL5 | 1St highest value is | 124.25671 | AT | 650025.76, | 4188683.34, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2ND HIGHEST VALUE IS | 78.16567 | AT | 650225.76, | 4188633.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3RD HIGHEST VALUE IS | 58.25919 | AT | 650025.76, | 4188733.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 51.13420 | AT | 650225.76, | 4188683.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC 5TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 50.67916 | AT | 650125.76, |  |
| 10.06, | $10.06, \quad 0.00) \quad D C$ | 40.97062 |  |  |  |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC | 40.97062 | AT | 649925.7 | 4188633.34, |
|  | 7TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 38.89260 | AT | 649925.76, | 4188683.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC 8TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 30.92790 | AT | 649925.76, | 4188733.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 29.69502 | AT | 650025.76, | 4188783.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00$)$ DC |  |  |  |  |
| 10.06, | 10TH HIGHEST VALUE IS 10.06, 0.00) DC | 29.42868 | AT | 650325.76, | 4188633.34, |
| VOL6 | 1St Highest value is | 108.73379 | AT | 650125.76, | 4188333.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2ND HIGHEST VALUE IS | 108.48266 | AT | 650025.76, | 4188383.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3RD HIGHEST VALUE IS | 87.15591 | AT | 650225.76, | 4188433.34, |


| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 86.87975 AT ( | 650225.76, | 4188383.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |
|  | 5 TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 63.13272 AT ( | 650225.76, | 4188333.34 , |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |
|  | 6 TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 55.25253 AT ( | 650025.76, | 4188333.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |
|  | 7TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 47.87228 AT ( | 650125.76, | 4188283.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |
|  | 8TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 40.97819 AT ( | 650225.76, | 4188283.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |
|  | 9 TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 38.21987 AT ( | 649925.76, | 4188433.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |
|  | 10TH HIGHEST VALUE IS | 33.04575 AT ( | 650325.76, | 4188383.34, |
| 10.06, | 10.06, 0.00) DC |  |  |  |


** CONC OF OTHER
IN MICROGRAMS/M**3

DATE
NETWORK
GROUP ID
(XR, YR, ZELEV, ZHILL, ZFLAG)
AVERAGE CONC (YYMMDDHH)
RECEPTOR
OF TYPE GRID-ID

-     -         -             -                 - . - . - - - - - - - -

VOL1 HIGH 1ST HIGH VALUE IS 2312.52925 ON 16010309: AT ( 650325.76, 4188383.34, 10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC

VOL2 HIGH 1ST HIGH VALUE IS 2142.77393 ON 17122909: AT ( 649725.76, 4188483.34, 10.06, 10.06, 0.00) DC

VOL3 HIGH 1ST HIGH VALUE IS 2142.89174 ON 17122909: AT ( 649725.76,



```
HARP2 - HRACalc (dated 22118) 10/26/2023 4:32:43 PM - Output Log
GLCs loaded successfully
Pollutants loaded successfully
Pathway receptors loaded successfully
************************************
RISK SCENARIO SETTINGS
Receptor Type: Resident
Scenario: Cancer
Calculation Method: HighEnd
EXPOSURE DURATION PARAMETERS FOR CANCER
Start Age: -0.25
Total Exposure Duration: 70
Exposure Duration Bin Distribution
3rd Trimester Bin: 0.25
0<2 Years Bin: 2
2<9 Years Bin: 0
2<16 Years Bin: 14
16<30 Years Bin: 0
16 to 70 Years Bin: 54
**********************************
PATHWAYS ENABLED
NOTE: Inhalation is always enabled and used for all assessments. The remaining
pathways are only used for cancer and noncancer chronic assessments.
Inhalation: True
Soil: True
Dermal: True
Mother's milk: True
Water: False
Fish: False
Homegrown crops: False
Beef: False
Dairy: False
Pig: False
Chicken: False
Egg: False
INHALATION
Daily breathing rate: LongTerm24HR
```

**Worker Adjustment Factors**
Worker adjustment factors enabled: NO
**Fraction at time at home**
3rd Trimester to 16 years: OFF
16 years to 70 years: ON
SOIL \& DERMAL PATHWAY SETTINGS
Deposition rate (m/s): 0.05
Soil mixing depth (m): 0.01
Dermal climate: Mixed
TIER 2 SETTINGS
Tier2 adjustments were used in this assessment. Please see the input file fordetails.Tier2 - What was changed: ED or start age changed|Calculating cancer risk
Cancer risk breakdown by pollutant and receptor saved to: C: \Users $\backslash$ Smith
PC (DESKTOP-977GSBU) \Documents \HRA \Ashley Warehouse - Revised
(Construction) \HARP2 $\backslash$ ASHLEY WAREHOUSE (CONSTRUCTION) \hra\Residential
CancerCancerRisk.csv
Cancer risk total by receptor saved to: C:\Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU) \Documents \HRA \Ashley Warehouse - Revised
(Construction) \HARP2 \ASHLEY WAREHOUSE (CONSTRUCTION) \hra\Residential
CancerCancerRiskSumByRec.csv
HRA ran successfully

```
HARP2 - HRACalc (dated 22118) 10/26/2023 5:42:55 PM - Output Log
GLCs loaded successfully
Pollutants loaded successfully
Pathway receptors loaded successfully
**************************************
RISK SCENARIO SETTINGS
Receptor Type: Resident
Scenario: Cancer
Calculation Method: HighEnd
EXPOSURE DURATION PARAMETERS FOR CANCER
Start Age: 16
Total Exposure Duration: 40
Exposure Duration Bin Distribution
3rd Trimester Bin: 0
0<2 Years Bin: 0
2<9 Years Bin: 0
2<16 Years Bin: 0
16<30 Years Bin: 0
16 to 70 Years Bin: 40
PATHWAYS ENABLED
NOTE: Inhalation is always enabled and used for all assessments. The remaining
pathways are only used for cancer and noncancer chronic assessments.
Inhalation: True
Soil: True
Dermal: True
Mother's milk: True
Water: False
Fish: False
Homegrown crops: False
Beef: False
Dairy: False
Pig: False
Chicken: False
Egg: False
INHALATION
```

Daily breathing rate: LongTerm24HR

```
**Worker Adjustment Factors**
Worker adjustment factors enabled: NO
**Fraction at time at home**
3rd Trimester to }16\mathrm{ years: OFF
16 years to }70\mathrm{ years: ON
SOIL & DERMAL PATHWAY SETTINGS
Deposition rate (m/s): 0.05
Soil mixing depth (m): 0.01
Dermal climate: Mixed
```


## TIER 2 SETTINGS

```
Tier 2 adjustments were used in this assessment. Please see the input file for details.
Tier2 - What was changed: ED or start age changed|
Calculating cancer risk
Cancer risk breakdown by pollutant and receptor saved to: C: \Users \(\backslash\) Smith \(\backslash\) Dropbox \(\backslash M y\)
PC (DESKTOP-977GSBU) \Documents \(\backslash H R A \backslash A s h l e y ~ W a r e h o u s e ~-~ R e v i s e d ~\)
(Construction) \HARP2\ASHLEY WAREHOUSE (CONSTRUCTION) \hra\Workplace
CancerCancerRisk.csv
Cancer risk total by receptor saved to: C:\Users \Smith\Dropbox \(\backslash M y\) PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU) \Documents \HRA\Ashley Warehouse - Revised
(Construction) \HARP2 \ASHLEY WAREHOUSE (CONSTRUCTION) \hra\Workplace CancerCancerRiskSumByRec.csv
HRA ran successfully
```

```
HARP2 - HRACalc (dated 22118) 10/26/2023 5:46:40 PM - Output Log
GLCs loaded successfully
Pollutants loaded successfully
Pathway receptors loaded successfully
***********************************
RISK SCENARIO SETTINGS
Receptor Type: Resident
Scenario: NCChronic
Calculation Method: Derived
EXPOSURE DURATION PARAMETERS FOR CANCER
**Exposure duration are only adjusted for cancer assessments**
PATHWAYS ENABLED
NOTE: Inhalation is always enabled and used for all assessments. The remaining
pathways are only used for cancer and noncancer chronic assessments.
Inhalation: True
Soil: False
Dermal: False
Mother's milk: False
Water: False
Fish: False
Homegrown crops: False
Beef: False
Dairy: False
Pig: False
Chicken: False
Egg: False
INHALATION
Daily breathing rate: LongTerm24HR
**Worker Adjustment Factors**
Worker adjustment factors enabled: NO
**Fraction at time at home**
NOTE: Exposure duration (i.e., start age, end age, ED, & FAH) are only adjusted for
cancer assessments.
TIER 2 SETTINGS
```

Tier2 adjustments were used in this assessment. Please see the input file fordetails.
Tier2 - What was changed: ED or start age changed|Calculating chronic risk
Chronic risk breakdown by pollutant and receptor saved to:
C: \Users\Smith \Dropbox\My PC (DESKTOP-977GSBU) \Documents $\backslash H R A \backslash A s h l e y ~ W a r e h o u s e ~-~$Revised (Construction) \HARP2\ASHLEY WAREHOUSE(CONSTRUCTION) \hra\ChronicNCChronicRisk.csv
Chronic risk total by receptor saved to: C: \Users\Smith\Dropbox\My PC
(DESKTOP-977GSBU) \Documents \HRA $\backslash$ Ashley Warehouse - Revised
(Construction) \HARP2\ASHLEY WAREHOUSE
(CONSTRUCTION) \hra\ChronicNCChronicRiskSumByRec.csv
HRA ran successfully

On-road Mobile (Operational) Energy Usage

```
Unmitigated:
Step 1
        Therefore
        Average Daily VMT:
        19,882 Source CaleEMod
Step 2 Given
        Fleet Mix (CalEEMod Output)
        LDA LOT1
            3%3%% LDT2
                MDV
                MOV
```



```6.6\% :1.58\%
```


## And

```
Gasoline MPG Factors for each Vehicle Class - Year 2025 (EMFAC2021 Output)
```



```
Diesel MPG Factors for each Vehicle Class - Year 2023 (EmFAC2021 Output)
P1p4
```



```
Therefore
Weighted Average MPG Factors
Gasoline \(\quad 26.8\)
26.8 Diesel:
esel: 6.4
Step 3 Therefore:
4.
or annual gallons of gasoline
```


## Off-road Mobile (Construction) Energy Usage

Note: $\quad$ For the sake of simplicity, and as a conservative estimation, it was assumed that all off-road vehicles use diesel fuel as an energy source.


| Mitigated Onsite Scenario | Total CO2 (MT/yr) (provided in CalEEMod Output File) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site Preparation (2023) | 2024 |
| Site Preparation (2024) | 231 |

On-road Mobile (Construction) Energy Usage - Site Preparation
Note: Year 2021 MPG factors were derived for construction-releated energy consumption (for the sake of a conservative estimate).

Step 1:
Total Daily Worker Trips (CaIEEMod Output) . 18.

Worker Trip Length (miles) (CalEEMod Output) 11,9

Therefore:
Average Worker Daily VMT: 214

Step 2: Given:
Assumed Fleet Mix for Workers (Percentage mix is provided on Appendix A: Calculation Details for CalEEMOD p. 15)
LDA $0.5^{\text {LDT1 }} 0.25^{\text {LDT2 }}$

And:
Gasoline MPG Factors for each Vehicle Class (EMFAC2021 Output) - Year 2023
LDA LDT1 LDT2
28.55 - 23.82 22 98

Therefore:
Weighted Average Worker MPG Factor 26.0

Step 3: Therefore:
8.2 Worker daily gallons of gasoline

Step 4: $\quad 161$ \# of Days (Caleemod Output)

Result:
Therefore:
Tutal gallons of gasoline

On-road Mobile (Construction) Energy Usage - Grading
Note: Year 2021 MPG factors were derived for construction-releated energy consumption (for the sake of a conservative estimate).

Step 1: Total Daily Worker Trips (CalEEMod Output)
(:)"20

Worker Trip Length (miles) (CaIEEMod Output)
11.9

Therefore:
Average Worker Daily VMT:
238

Total Hauling Trips (CalEEMod Output)
-

Hauling Trip Length (miles) (CalEEMod Output) 20

Average Vendor Daily VMT:

Step 2: Given:
Assumed Fleet Mix for Workers

LDA $\quad$| IDT1 | IDT2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.25 | 0.25 |

Fleet Mix for Workers (Conservative Estimate) MHD HHD
(Percentage mix is provided on Appendix A: Calculation Details for CalEEMOD p. 15) 0\%: 100\% And:
Gasoline MPG Factors for each Vehicle Class (EMFAC2021 Output) - Year 2023
LDA LDT1 LDT2 Diesel:
28.55 -23.82 $\quad \therefore 22.98$

MHD HHD
Therefore:
Weighted Average Worker MPG Factor
26.0

Weighted Average Hauling (Diesel) MPG Factor 5.6

Step 3: Therefore:
9.2 Worker daily gallons of gasoline

Step 4: $\quad 155$ \# of Days (CalEEMod Output)

Therefore: Therefore:
Result: Total gallons of gasoline
Therefore:
Total gallons of diesel

## On-road Mobile (Construction) Energy Usage - Building Construction

Note: Year 2021 MPG factors were derived for construction-releated energy consumption (for the sake of a conservative estimate).

Step 1: $\quad$ Total Daily Worker Trips (CalEEMod Output) $\therefore$
Note: Assumes $5 \%$ of workers are on-site on a given day.

Worker Trip Length (miles) (CalEEMod Output)
$\because: 11.9$

Therefore:
Average Worker Daily VMT:
74

Total Daily Vendor Trips (CaIEEMod Output) 2
Note: Assumes $5 \%$ of workers are on-site on a given day.

Vendor Trip Length (miles) (CalEEMod Output) 9.1

Average Vendor Daily VMT:
22

Step 2: Given:
Assumed Fleet Mix for Workers (Percentage mix is provided on Appendix A: Calculation Detals for CaIEEMOD p. 15)
LDA LDT1 LDT2 $\quad$ Fleet Mix for Workers (CalEEMod Output)

Assumed Fleet Mix for Vendors $\quad 100 \% \quad 0 \%$.

And:
MPG Factors for each Vehicle Class (from EMFAC2021) - Year 2023
Gasoline:
Diesel:


Therefore:
Weighted Average Worker (Gasoline) MPG Factor
26.0

Step 3: Therefore:
3 Worker daily gallons of gasoline
Weighted Average Vendor (Diesel) MPG Factor 8.6

Therefore:

150 \# of Days (CalEEMod Output)
Step 4:

Therefore:
. Total gallons of gasoline

Therefore:人) Total gallons of diesel

## On-road Mobile (Construction) Energy Usage - Paving

Note: Year 2021 MPG factors were derived for construction-releated energy consumption (for the sake of a conservative estimate)
Step 1: Total Daily25.
Worker Trip Length (miles) (CalEEMod Output)11.911.9
Therefore:
Average Worker Daily VMT:
Step 2: Given:
Assumed Fleet Mix for Workers (Percentage mix is provided on Appendix A: Calculation Details for CalEEMOD p. 15
LDA LDT1 LDT2
$05 \quad 0250.25$
Fleet Mix for Workers (Conservative Estimate)
MHD HHD
0\% 400
And:
Gasoline MPG Factors for each Vehicle Class (EMFAC2021 Output) - Year 2023
LDA LDT1 ..... LDT2
Diesel:
28.55 23.82 22.98 MHD ..... HHDTherefore:
Weighted Average Hauling (Diesel) MPG Factor
Therefore:
e:
Therefore
Weighted Average Worker MPG Factor

Average Worker MPG Factor26.0
6.9 Worker daily gallons of gasoline
6.9 Worker daily gallons of gasoline
Step 4:
90 \# of Days (CalEEMod Output)
Therefore:
Result: Tummex Total gallons of gasoline
Hauling Trip Length (miles) (CalEemod Output)20

Total Hauling Trips (Caleemod Output)
$\qquad$*'
Average Vendor Daily VMT:179

179

On-road Mobile (Construction) Energy Usage - Architectural Coatings
Note: Year 2021 MPG factors were derived for construction-releated energy consumption (for the sake of a conservative estimate).
Step 1: Total Daily Worker Trips (CaIEEMod Output)
Total Hauling Trips (CalEEMod Output)
1
Worker Trip Length (miles) (CalEEMod Output)Hauling Trip Length (miles) (CaIEEMod Output)4.9
20
Therefore:
Average Worker Daily VMT: Average Vendor Daily VMT:

Average Vendor Daily VMT:
15
Step 2: Given:
Assumed Fleet Mix for Workers (Percentage mix is provided on Appendix A: Calculation Details for CalEEMOD p. 15)
LDA LDT1 LDT2 Fleet Mix for Workers (Conservative Estimate)
$\because \vdots 0 . \quad 025=025$ MHD HHD
0\% 100\%
And:
Gasoline MPG Factors for each Vehicle Class (EMFAC2021 Output) - Year 2023
LDA LDT1 LDT2 Diesel:
28.55 23. 22.98 MHD HHD
Therefore:
Weighted Average Worker MPG Factor 26.0
Weighted Average Hauling (Diesel) MPG Factor
Therefore:
0.6 Worker daily gallons of gasoline
Step 4: $\quad 121$ \# of Days (CalEEMod Output)
Result:

Therefore:
16.W. Total gallons of gasoline

Therefore:


Region Type County
Region: San Joaquin
Calendar Year 2023, 2025
Season: Annual
Vehicle Classification EMFAC202x Categories
Units miles/day for CVMT and EVMT, trips/day for Trips, kWh /day for Energy Consumption, tons/day for Emissions, 1000 gallons/day for Fuel Consumption

| Region | Calendar Year Vehicle Category | Model Year | Speed | Fuel | Population | Total VMT | Trips | Fuel Consumption | MPG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Joaquin | 2023 All Other Buses | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 5339460475 | 339393922 | 564.2119822 | 0391421545 | 8.670803 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 LDA | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 246367.0682 | 9973102.47 | 1138235.391 | 3493216614 | 28.54991 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 LDA | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 705.734891 | 231398254 | 3023.214022 | 0543997543 | 42.53664 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 LDT1 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 22016.87719 | 727225.714 | 95173.38769 | 3052486616 | 23.82404 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 LDT1 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 6.309776167 | 72.3140659 | 1853577151 | 0002954101 | 24.47922 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 LDT2 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 9998664004 | 4006976.31 | 463638.6569 | 1743583341 | 22.98127 |
| San loaquin | 2023 LDT2 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 269.0353638 | 117677731 | 1277.639106 | 0369317903 | 31.86353 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 LHD1 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 9831305478 | 343356.563 | 146471.803 | 370137846 | 9.276451 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 LHD1 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 8858.793592 | 31128778 | 111432.479 | 1967413691 | 15.82218 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 LHD2 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 1172.202392 | 409328123 | 17464.06906 | 4.90823024 | 8.339628 |
| San loaquin | 2023 LHD2 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 3130.564849 | 115648.086 | 3937856755 | 8863291415 | 13.04798 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 MCY | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 1211177426 | 65765.9483 | 24223.54852 | 1.643730409 | 40.01018 |
| San loaquin | 2023 MDV | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 9453947242 | 3309649.73 | 4272878869 | 178.486066 | 18.5429 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 MDV | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1386649679 | 54072.4946 | 6485715736 | 2.267270858 | 23.84916 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 MH | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 1507494843 | 13134.1796 | 150.8097841 | 2.977418428 | 4.411264 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 MH | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 642.7961913 | 56466428 | 6427961913 | 0.600452961 | 9.403972 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 Motor Coach | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1750069597 | 2493.47591 | 4021659934 | 0.455354651 | 5.475899 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 OBUS | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 184.2186442 | 81435346 | 3685.846633 | 1.733278965 | 4.69834 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 PTO | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 0 | 197695175 | 0 | 4013121008 | 4.92622 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 SBUS | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 127.6658449 | 701140481 | 510.6633795 | 0.69096273 | 10.1473 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 SBUS | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 488.0661519 | 109997571 | 7067.197879 | 1346323697 | 8.170217 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 CAIRP Class 4 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1021525791 | 684.779876 | 234.7466267 | 0077405114 | 8.846701 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 CAIRP Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diese | 13.70885779 | 939.491781 | 315.0295519 | 0.106056052 | 8.858446 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 CAIRP Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 43.24157557 | 245339435 | 993.6914066 | 0.273109788 | 8.98318 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 CAIRP Class 7 | Agrregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 74.64743229 | 15398.8197 | 1715397994 | 1.609252898 | 9.568925 MHD |
| San loaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Delivery Class 4 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 243.75384 | 8276.65194 | 3478.367297 | 1005561316 | 8.2308778 .579141 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Delivery Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 156.2432876 | 538385911 | 2229.591714 | 0657027122 | 8.194272 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Delivery Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 6826025228 | 233639411 | 9740.738001 | 2839033489 | 8.229541 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Delivery Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 122.4768589 | 670321055 | 1747.744776 | 0802391793 | 8.354037 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Other Class 4 | Aggregate | Ageregate | Diesel | 4498451938 | 18399.4289 | 5200.21044 | 2.166542487 | 8.492531 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Other Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diese! | 1174.570894 | 519436226 | 13578.03953 | 6096265009 | 8. 520565 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Other Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 9125417949 | 38573.6428 | 10548.98315 | 450612298 | 8.560273 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Other Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 553092214 | 25667.2012 | 6393.745994 | 2950154535 | 8.70029 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Tractor Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Dresel | 10.69132111 | 510.925844 | 123.591672 | 0060247854 | 8.480399 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Instate Tractor Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 696.5366058 | 428024924 | 8051.963163 | 4748833943 | 9.013264 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 00S Class 4 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 5905142679 | 392.334655 | 1357001788 | 0044317954 | 8.852725 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 OoS Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 7890998517 | 538.212595 | 1813351459 | 0060737656 | 8.861267 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 OOS Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 2497157764 | 140636491 | 5738468541 | 0156409596 | 8.991551 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 OOS Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 4057354344 | 10226.0217 | 932.3800283 | 1.062980063 | 9.620144 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Public Class 4 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 3209216486 | 105660486 | 164.6328057 | 0.140824099 | 7.503012 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Public Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 7627568061 | 277664108 | 3912942415 | 0.361173048 | 7.687841 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Public Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 126.4582156 | 4446297 | 6487306462 | 0.576020372 | 7.718993 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Public Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 152.7305258 | 6768.06936 | 7835075973 | 0883776286 | 7.658125 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Utility Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 33.47606031 | 136493307 | 428.493572 | 0154770907 | 8.819055 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Utility Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 6.356456131 | 257.430851 | 8136263848 | 0029104667 | 8.845002 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6 Utility Class 7 | Agregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 7.230830053 | 358500092 | 9255462468 | 0.040337535 | 8.887506 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T6TS | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 560525111 | 27400.6685 | 11214.98642 | 5.873758607 | 4.664929 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 CAIRP Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1500.771839 | 308143.872 | 34487.73687 | 5100604804 | 6.04132 HHD |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 NNOOS Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Dresel | 1343474448 | 364734.036 | 3087304281 | 5983110996 | 6.096065 .596459 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 NOOS Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 562.3598205 | 132501.396 | 1292302868 | 2197566159 | 6.029461 |
| San joaquin | 2023 T7 Other Port Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 286781176 | 5381.65764 | 469174004 | 0.90785985 | 5.927851 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 POAK Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1311211785 | 13188.0173 | 2145142481 | 226470624 | 5.823279 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 POLA Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 139.588006 | 1835309 | 2283.659779 | 3.154875131 | 5.817374 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 Public Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 387066761 | 165339411 | 1985652484 | 3.205449572 | 5.158072 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 Single Concrete/Transit Mix Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 118.1878034 | 859590453 | 1113329108 | 1.467125303 | 5.859012 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 Single Dump Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 486.5561857 | 307070394 | 4583359269 | 5.327318734 | 5.76407 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 Single Other Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1040.735731 | 570424876 | 9803730584 | 9736964144 | 5.858344 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 SWCV Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 175044521 | 11346.9523 | 8052047965 | 4507153801 | 2.517543 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 I7 Tractor Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 2638276559 | 211937.817 | 38334.1584 | 34.91925222 | 6.069369 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7 Utility Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 2322093261 | 108067322 | 297.2279374 | 0186573576 | 5.792209 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 T7/S | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 2.419215607 | 60.0081934 | 4840366587 | 0018776223 | 3.195967 |
| San loaquin | 2023 UBU5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 49369827 | 371955506 | 197.479308 | 0.791708132 | 4.698139 |
| San Joaquin | 2023 UBUS | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 7833872382 | 5427523 | 313.3548953 | 0.602229331 | 9.012386 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 All Other 8uses | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 67.92171408 | 3454.27959 | 6045032553 | 0395338932 | 8.737514 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 LDA | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 247812.193 | 100654187 | 1143376.643 | 3406379829 | 29.54873 |
| San loaquin | 2025 LDA | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 6208563183 | 19917.7375 | 2643071074 | 0459921869 | 43.30678 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 LDT 1 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 2096962889 | 704503526 | 90823.61908 | 2855436416 | 24.67236 |
| San loaquin | 2025 LDT1 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 5.057977491 | 54.7985719 | 1433247387 | 0002232746 | 24.54313 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 LDT2 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 1058872734 | 4297523.94 | 4916689279 | 1790193905 | 24.00591 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 LDT2 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 305.5941154 | 135584186 | 1463.961841 | 0410704288 | 33.01261 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 LHD1 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 9450489324 | 335570018 | 140798.2097 | 3490157426 | 9.614753 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 LHD1 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 8447.684296 | 292201.982 | 106261.2413 | 1838163512 | 15.89641 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 LHD2 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 1129.168714 | 394962437 | 1682293138 | 4600897482 | 8.584465 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 LHD2 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 3098.911716 | 112092227 | 3898041096 | 8.493201579 | 13.19788 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 MCY | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 1200969999 | 64631.0827 | 2401939998 | 1598967718 | 40.42051 |
| San loaquin | 2025 MDV | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 9244653152 | 3253692.9 | 4171411232 | 1690306745 | 19.24913 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 MDV | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1393091492 | 519519772 | 6420977754 | 2.139013823 | 24.28782 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 MH | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 1345.73466 | 11738.0981 | 1346272954 | 2660033836 | 4.412763 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 MH | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 631.6240768 | 5453.24118 | 6316240768 | 0580283559 | 9.397546 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 Motor Coach | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1880772922 | 251451501 | 4322016174 | 0452917647 | 5.551815 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 OBUS | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoine | 1708324994 | 730903024 | 3418016649 | 1.52248184 | 4.800734 |


| San Joaquin | 2025 PTO | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 0 | 20105.4227 | 0 | 3.98427046 | 5.046199 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San loaquin | 2025 sbus | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 131.6189784 | 7271.29468 | 526.4759134 | 071341232 | 10.19228 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 SBUS | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 4902787139 | 10849.6548 | 7099235777 | 1320741795 | 8.214819 | MHD |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 CAIRP Class 4 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 10.57610418 | 697.742444 | 243.038874 | 0077548733 | 8.997471 | 8.711536 |
| San loaquin | 2025 T6 CAIRP Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 14.00551629 | 958.755772 | 3218467643 | 0.106617779 | 8.992457 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 CAIRP Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 4729566683 | 248835531 | 1086.854424 | 0.272426579 | 9.13404 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 CAIRP Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 7811014265 | 15772.0773 | 1794.971078 | 1.605687139 | 9.822634 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Instate Delivery Class 4 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 252.424868 | 8475.97193 | 3602102866 | 1019116289 | 8.316982 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Instate Delivery Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1624907366 | 5516.89416 | 2318.742812 | 0.666350411 | 8.279269 |  |
| San loaquin | 2025 T6 Instate Delivery Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 7081406495 | 23932.0747 | 10105.16707 | 287788442 | 8.315857 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Instate Delivery Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 127.2799027 | 6929.15534 | 1816. 284212 | 0.825964977 | 8.389164 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Instate Other Class 4 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 457.3843802 | 18839.146 | 5287.363435 | 2.200026822 | 8.563144 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Instate Other Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1233945904 | 53254.2945 | 1426441465 | 6.208167542 | 8.578102 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Instate Other Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 9395521797 | 39531.7219 | 108612232 | 4582174014 | 8.627285 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 instate Other Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 6012468734 | 263267381 | 6950.413857 | 3002944814 | 8.766974 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Instate Tractor Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1109411194 | 521271565 | 1282479341 | 0060836197 | 8.568444 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Instate Tractor Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 7428431118 | 44239.5012 | 8587266373 | 4.878765067 | 9.067766 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 OOS Class 4 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 6191325924 | 405.515484 | 142.2766697 | 0044545776 | 9.103343 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 OOS Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 8158025029 | 556.294323 | 1874714152 | 0.061223253 | 9.086324 |  |
| San loaquin | 2025 T6 OOS Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 2775525515 | 1453.61298 | 637.8157633 | 0156720574 | 9.275189 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 OOS Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 4205361037 | 10569.5739 | 966.3919663 | 1066856767 | 9.90721 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Public Class 4 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 3096340517 | 1050.77782 | 1588422685 | 0137051326 | 7.667039 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Public Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diese! | 7740598482 | 2785.90976 | 397.0927021 | 0357713881 | 7.788095 |  |
| 5an Joaquin | 2025 T6 Public Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1244648645 | 4446.56253 | 6385047549 | 0.566454177 | 7.849819 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Public Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1482002736 | 6742.4666 | 7602674038 | 0.856702113 | 7.870258 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Utility Class 5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 33.80713566 | 137126265 | 4327313364 | 0154052822 | 8.90125 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Utility Class 6 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 6404694197 | 258.753793 | 8198008572 | 0028984726 | 8.927246 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6 Utılity Class 7 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Dresel | 7.233394318 | 359399463 | 9258744727 | 0039964166 | 8.993043 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T6TS | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 5310756316 | 2732154 | 1062576124 | 5.695995374 | 4.796623 | HHD |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T7 CAIRP Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1559.383676 | 317454.145 | 3583463687 | 5117555421 | 6.203238 | 5.689878 |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T7 NNOOS Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1399.986354 | 379791.503 | 3217168641 | 5950406302 | 6.382615 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T7 NOOS Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 5929033383 | 137971.507 | 1362491871 | 2213949036 | 6.231919 |  |
| San Joaquin | 202577 Other Port Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 31.09466321 | 5773.39367 | 5087086901 | 0965450648 | 5.979999 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T7 POAK Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 137.4284865 | 13680.6366 | 2248330039 | 2.333991731 | 5.861476 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T7 POLA Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 157478818 | 19849822 | 2576353462 | 3.419583803 | 5.804748 |  |
| 5 an Joaquin | 2025 T7 Public Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 3864284577 | 16615451 | 1982377988 | 3157962941 | 5.261446 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T7 Single Concrete/Transit Mix Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Dresel | 1210999578 | 8533.43151 | 1140761603 | 1428680336 | 5.972947 |  |
| San Joaquen | 2025 T7 Single Dump Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 5183758674 | 308552217 | 4883.100671 | 5328325632 | 5.790791 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T Single Other Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1163187559 | 58572.1124 | 1095722681 | 9897066107 | 5.918129 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T7 5WCV Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 1675568448 | 108623368 | 770.7614863 | 4.227120943 | 2.569677 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 I7 Tractor Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 2947082282 | 219605844 | 42821.10556 | 35.73125002 | 6.146044 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T7 Utility Class 8 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 24.5522509 | 109654573 | 314.2688115 | 0187591616 | 5.845388 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 T7/5 | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 1.372290651 | 542951776 | 27.45679134 | 0.014900233 | 3.643915 |  |
| San joaquin | 2025 UBus | Aggregate | Aggregate | Gasoline | 5067993554 | 3818.16315 | 202.7197421 | 0.812722391 | 4.697992 |  |
| San Joaquin | 2025 UBUS | Aggregate | Aggregate | Diesel | 7334639924 | 497717265 | 2933855969 | 0526331001 | 9.456355 |  |


[^0]:    WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed Project is consistent with the Limited Industrial land use goals and policies of the City of Lathrop General Plan and is also consistent with the development standards for the IL-CL, Limited Industrial Zoning District and the Central Lathrop Specific Plan Phase 2 Amendment as further implemented through the Zoning Code Text Amendment; and

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The data utilized in Dr. Smallwood's evaluation of the SJMSCP is available at: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/mzkfrnz0utg7gd6oldk $4 \mathrm{~b} / \mathrm{h}$ ?rlkey=zkf15bmetrp0g95u9mi7kxtc3 $\& \mathrm{dl}=0$

[^2]:    1 "Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, available at: https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf, p. 8-7 Equation 8.2.4.

[^3]:    2 "Sierra Club v. County of Fresno." Supreme Court of California, December 2018, available at: https://cegaportal.org/decisions/1907/Sierra\%20Club\%20v.\%20County\%20of\%20Fresno.pdf.
    ${ }^{3}$ "Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act." State of California Department of Justice, available at: https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/environment/warehouse-best-practices.pdf, p. 6.
    4 "Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, available at: https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf, p. 8-18. 5 "Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, available at: https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf, p. 8-18.

[^4]:    6 "Guidance Manual for preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, available at: https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf p. 8-4

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ See here for more detail: https://www.pge.com/en_US/about-pge/environment/what-we-are-doing/clean-energy-solutions/clean-energy-solutions.page
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