CHAPTER 7

ASSESSMENT OF CEQA ALTERNATIVES

Description of Alternatives

Air Quality Benefits of Alternatives

Socioeconomic Impacts Comparison

Summary

INTRODUCTION

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the District evaluated alternatives to the proposed 1997 AQMP. These alternatives include a range of reasonable options that could feasibly meet the project objective. This chapter addresses the socioeconomic impacts of the alternatives proposed in the draft EIR.

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The draft EIR for the draft 1997 AQMP identifies the following three alternatives to the proposed plan:

Alternative 1-No Project Alternative (1994 AQMP)

Alternative 1 is the 1994 State Implementation Plan with updated control measures and their implementation dates. Alternative 1 also has measures for controlling emissions from indirect sources. The net effect of the No Project Alternative would be a continuation of the existing 1994 AQMP as approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

Alternative 2-Temporal/Seasonal Shift Control Strategy

Alternative 2 would implement the same short- and intermediate-term and advanced control measures as the draft 1997 AQMP. However, Alternative 2 would allow an increase of up to 50 percent of VOC emissions from point sources during the non-smog season (November through April) when the federal ozone standard is not violated.

Alternative 3-Fugitive Dust versus NOx Control Strategy

Alternative 3 replaces some NOx control in the draft 1997 AQMP with two additional PM 10 control measures: CTY-12 (Paved Roads--Curbs and Gutter/Chemical Stabilization) and CTY-13 (Construction and Demolition Activities) whose implementation would begin in 1997. In addition, Alternative 3 would accelerate the implementation of control measure BCM-3 (Unpaved Roads, Parking Lots, and Staging Areas). Concurrently, Alternative 3 would reduce by 21 tons the amount of NOx emission reductions that would be required of from non-RECLAIM stationary and off-road sources, beginning in 2006, under the draft 1997 AQMP.

AIR QUALITY BENEFITS OF ALTERNATIVES

This socioeconomic analysis compares the air quality benefit resulting from implementation of the Plan with respect to the baseline "no control" scenario for ozone, PM10, and visibility. The draft 1997 AQMP has been demonstrated to attain the federal PM10 standards in 2006 and the federal ozone standard in 2010. The same can be said of all alternatives. The draft 1997 AQMP along with all alternatives are projected to attain the state visibility standard in 2010.

SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS COMPARISON

Table 7-1 compares the direct costs, direct air quality benefits, and job impacts of the various alternatives to the draft 1997 AQMP. These socioeconomic impacts include both quantified and unquantified measures and benefits. Since the socioeconomic assessment is performed on an annual basis, no additional analysis is performed for Alternative 2 whose only difference from the draft 1997 AQMP is to allow an increase of emissions during the winter provided that the federal air quality standards are not violated. The benefit associated with PM10 reductions in Alternative 3 is assumed to be the same as that in the draft 1997 AQMP. No PM10 modeling was performed for Alternative 3. All the alternatives as well as the draft Plan use the same estimate for the congestion relief benefit. Furthermore, costs associated with displaced NOx control in Alternative 3 cannot be assessed at this time. This is because the alternative does not identify specific NOx control measures for elimination at this point but rather only identifies a tonnage of NOx emission reductions which could be forgone while still achieving the same air quality through additional PM10 control.

TABLE 7-1

Average Annual Impacts of AQMP Alternatives
versus the Draft 1997 AQMP

Alternatives	Costs	Benefits	Jobs
	(millions of 93 dollars)		
Draft 1997 AQMP	$1,709	$1,840 - 1,926	+17,282
No Project--1994 AQMP (1)	$2,107	$1,994 - 2,080	+18,024
Temporal/Seasonal (2)	$1,709	$1,840 - 1,926	+17,282
Fugitive Dust vs. NOx Control (3)	< $1,710	$1,844 - 1,929	> +17,360

In terms of costs, the Fugitive Dust versus NOx Control alternative probably is the least expensive considering the cost of the displaced NOx control has not been removed from the above numbers. The No Project Alternative is the most expensive because it contains more control measures.

The draft 1997 AQMP along with all the alternatives are demonstrated to meet the federal air quality standards for ozone and PM10, and the state visibility standard by 2010 and have similar monetary benefits. The No Project alternative shows the best air quality results and thus has the highest benefit (about $2 billion). However, the No Project alternative has fewer benefits than costs. The benefit of Alternative 3 is slightly higher than that of the draft 1997 AQMP because Alternative 3 has a slightly lower value of peak one-hour ozone concentration than the draft 1997 AQMP in 2010.

In terms of the job impact, all the alternatives and the draft 1997 AQMP are projected to foster continued growth of the local economy. The No Projective alternative has the highest number of jobs created, followed by the Fugitive Dust versus NOx Control alternative and the draft Plan.

SUMMARY

Except for the No Project alternative (where costs outweigh benefits) the draft Plan, the Temporal/Seasonal Shift alternative, and the Fugitive Dust versus NOx Control alternative have similar cost, benefit, and job impacts. The Fugitive Dust versus NOx Control alternative has slightly lower costs as well as higher benefits and job creation than the rest. The differences are small, especially considering the uncertainty embedded in the modeling analysis.