

FINDINGS and STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

The California Air Resources Board (CARB), as the lead agency for the proposed Regulatory Amendments to the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) (Proposed Amendments), prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) in accordance with its certified regulatory program (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 17, §§ 60000 – 60008) to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, §21000, *et seq.*). The Draft EIA, entitled *Draft Environmental Impact Analysis prepared for the Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Regulation*, and included as Appendix D to the Staff Report (Initial Statement of Reasons), provided an analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Amendments. Following circulation of the Draft EIA for a 45-day public review and comment period from January 5, 2024, through February 20, 2024, CARB identified revisions to certain aspects of the proposal that merited revisions to the project description, air quality and greenhouse gas (GHS) sections. CARB determined that recirculation of those portions of the Draft EIA was warranted. The Recirculated Draft EIA was released for a 45-day comment period from August 16, 2024 through September 30, 2024. CARB prepared the *Final Environmental Analysis prepared for the Proposed to the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Regulation* (Final EIA) which incorporates the Recirculated EIA project description, air quality analysis, and GHG analysis and includes minor revisions to the Draft EIA. While minor modifications have been made to the Final EIA to ensure it reflects the proposed project as accurately as possible, these changes merely clarify, amplify, or make insignificant modifications to the otherwise-adequate EIA. Therefore, there is no significant new information that would require the Final EIA to be recirculated. The Final EIA was posted on CARB's webpage on November 6, 2024.

This statement of findings and overriding considerations was prepared to comply with CEQA's requirement to address the environmental impacts identified in the Final EIA. (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21081, 21081.6, Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, §§ 15091, 15093.) The Final EIA is based on the expected compliance responses of the regulated entities covered by the Proposed Amendments. Although the policy aspects and requirements of the Proposed Amendments would not directly change the physical environment, potential indirect physical changes to the environment could result from reasonably foreseeable actions undertaken by entities in response to the Proposed Amendments. These indirect impacts are the focus of the programmatic-level impacts analysis in the Final EIA.

Collectively, across all categories, the Final EIA concluded that the reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Regulation could cause the following short-term and long-term impacts: beneficial impacts to GHG emissions; less than significant impacts to air quality odors, energy demand, mineral resources (short-term construction-related), population and housing, public services, recreation, and wildfire; and potentially significant adverse impacts to aesthetics, agriculture and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources (long-term operational-related), noise, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service

systems. The potentially significant and unavoidable adverse impacts are disclosed for both short-term, construction-related activities, and long-term operational activities, which is why some resource areas are identified above as having both less-than-significant impacts and potentially significant impacts.

CARB's certified regulatory program requires that before adoption of an action for which significant adverse environmental impacts have been identified during the review process, CARB consider feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that could substantially reduce the impacts. (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 17, § 60004.2.) CEQA places the burden on the approving agency to affirmatively show it has considered feasible mitigation and alternatives that can lessen or avoid identified impacts through a statement of findings for each identified significant impact. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.) The CEQA Guidelines, in California Code of Regulations, title 14, at section 15091, provide direction on the content of the statement of findings. That section states that one or more of these findings should be identified for each impact:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, such projects which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final environmental impact report.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

The potential adverse impacts identified in this programmatic level EIA are potential indirect impacts associated with the compliance responses that are reasonably foreseeable, based on available information, in response to the Proposed Amendments. The ability to determine site- or project-specific impacts of projects carried out by third parties to comply with the Proposed Amendments and the authority to require feasible mitigation lies with those agencies with authority to approve such actions, e.g. local permitting authorities in city or county governments and local air districts. CARB does not have the ability to determine with any specificity the potential impacts of projects undertaken in response to the Proposed Amendments, nor the authority to require mitigation for such projects, in approving the Proposed Amendments, as discussed in the findings below.

An agency may approve a project with unavoidable (unmitigated) adverse environmental impacts. When doing so, CEQA requires the agency to make a statement in the record of its views on the ultimate balancing of the merits of approving the project despite the environmental impacts in a "statement of overriding considerations." (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(b); Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 15093.) The following provides CARB Board's (Board) statement of findings for each significant adverse impact identified in the Final EIA, which is hereby incorporated by reference herein, as well as a brief explanation and its statement of overriding considerations.

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

The Board has independently reviewed and considered the entire record, including the information in the Final EIA, public testimony, written comments received, and the written responses to environmental comments, which are incorporated by reference. The Board makes these written findings for each significant adverse impact identified, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. For a complete discussion of the compliance responses relevant to each resource area, please see Chapter 4.0 of the Final EIA. These findings are supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Aesthetics

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant short-term construction-related impacts and long-term operational impacts on aesthetic resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, alternative jet fuel (AJF), and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and plug-in electric vehicle (EV) charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. In general, infrastructure already exists to support increased shipments of feedstock crops and fuels via rail and ocean-going vessels. New production plants for renewable diesel, biodiesel, biodiesel additives, AJF, hydrogen and biomethane could be constructed and operated to meet future demands. Similarly, construction and operation of future innovative technology facilities for drop-in renewable biofuels and Fisher-Tropsch diesel could be developed. Construction and operation of additional hydrogen stations, solar and wind electricity generation projects, and EV charging stations could also be developed to meet future demands and in response to the expanded hydrogen and electric charging infrastructure provisions. New pipelines for renewable natural gas and hydrogen could also

be constructed to meet future increased demand for these fuels. Rail and trucking routes could also expand to transport these fuels into and throughout California. Development of new facilities and infrastructure would be expected to occur in areas zoned in accordance with the land use types associated with this kind of development (e.g., industrial, agricultural); however, such facilities could conceivably introduce or increase the presence of visible artificial elements (e.g., heavy-duty equipment; new or expanded buildings; electric charging; hydrogen fueling stations; solar, geothermal, and wind infrastructure) in areas of scenic importance, such as visibility from State scenic highways. The visual impact of such development would depend on several variables, including the type and size of facilities, distance and angle of view, visual prominence (including presence of visual obstructions), and placement in the landscape. In addition, facility operation may introduce substantial sources of glare, exhaust plumes, and nighttime lighting for safety and security purposes. These types of impacts could result in significant effects on aesthetic resources.

The Final EIA includes Mitigation Measure 1-1, which identifies existing statutes and regulations and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measure 1-1 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measure 1-1 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the Final EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, there is inherent uncertainty in the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Agriculture and Forest Resources

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant impacts associated with new facilities and feedstock cultivation on agriculture and forest resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites;

construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. If facilities are proposed in response to the Proposed Amendments, potential impacts to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, Williamson Act conservation contracts, or forest land or timberland, must be reviewed by local or state lead agencies in the context of future project approvals. Many local governments have adopted land use policies to protect important agricultural and forest land from conversion to urban development, including industrial facilities. While it is reasonable to anticipate that land use policies controlling the location of new industrial facilities would generally avoid conversion of important agricultural land, the potential cannot be entirely dismissed. If a facility were located on important farmland or property under a Williamson Act Contract, conversion of the agricultural land to urban uses could occur. Decisions regarding land use and feedstock choices would have an impact on how much biofuel could be produced in a given area. However, because the Proposed Amendments would provide incentives that could lead to an increase in the production of certain agricultural feedstocks to produce low-carbon biofuels, and because such an increase could contribute to potential land use changes that could adversely affect agricultural and forest resources, this impact would be significant.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measures 2-1 and 2-2, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measures 2-1 and 2-2 are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measures 2-1 and 2-2 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the Final EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, there is inherent uncertainty in the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Air Quality

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant short-term construction-related and long-term operational-related impacts on air quality. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Implementation of the Proposed Amendments could include construction of new refueling infrastructure or modifications to existing facilities. At this time, the specific location, type, and number of construction activities are not known and would be dependent upon a variety of factors that are not within the control or authority of CARB and not within its purview. Nonetheless, the analysis presented herein provides a good-faith disclosure of the general types of construction emission impacts that could occur with implementation of these reasonably foreseeable compliance responses. Further, subsequent environmental review would be conducted at such time that an individual project is proposed, and land use or construction approvals are sought. Notwithstanding the efforts of CARB and local air districts to monitor and reduce criteria pollutant emissions, and despite estimated beneficial long-term operational impacts statewide, localized increases in emissions because of the Proposed

Amendments could occur near biofuel production facilities and routes for biofuel feedstock and finished fuel transportation. These potential local increases in emissions would be largely dependent on the extent and location of increased biofuel production. Because the LCFS does not specify the specific sites at which alternative fuels are produced, both the extent of increased biofuel production and the location of potential new biofuel facilities cannot be known at this time and would be too speculative to quantify.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measures 3-1 and 3-2, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measures 3-1 and 3-2 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measures 3-1 and 3-2 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Biological Resources

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant impacts on biological resources related to new facilities or infrastructure and land use changes. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on

cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. The biological resources that could be affected by the construction and operation of new or modified manufacturing plants or renewable energy projects would depend on the specific location of any necessary construction and its environmental setting. Adverse impacts could include modifications to existing habitat; including removal, degradation, and fragmentation of riparian systems, wetlands, or other sensitive natural wildlife habitat and plant communities; interference with wildlife movement or wildlife nursery sites; loss of special-status species; and/or conflicts with the provisions of adopted habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other conservation plans or policies to protect natural resources. Depending on the type of crop, location, and need to convert lands, habitat destruction could occur, resulting in the loss of biodiversity. Removal of natural undeveloped lands could lead to irreversible non-GHG impacts, such as loss of species populations, or impacts with a payback (“grow back”) period of up to a few hundred years.¹ The location of new crop lands may also affect conservation plans or disrupt important migratory routes. Indirect effects could occur as well, such as increased pesticide and nutrient use, the runoff of which could be detrimental to individual species. Even with land use change quantification and crop-based biofuels sustainability criteria as guardrails, there is still some potential for changes in land use, which could have adverse effects on biological species and their habitats.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measures 4-1 and 4-2, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measures 4-1 and 4-2 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measures 4-1 and 4-2 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

¹ Lapola, D. M., R. Schaldach, J. Alcamo, A. Bondeau, J. Koch, C. Koelking, & Priess, J. A., *Indirect Land-Use Changes Can Overcome Carbon Savings from Biofuels in Brazil*. PNAS 107 (8): 3388–3393. February 23, 2010. <http://www.pnas.org/content/107/8/3388.full.pdf+html>

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Cultural Resources

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant short-term construction-related impacts and long-term operational impacts on cultural resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Construction activities could require disturbance of undeveloped area, such as clearing of vegetation, earth movement and grading, trenching for utility lines and gas pipelines, erection of new buildings, and paving of parking lots, delivery areas, and roadways. Demolition of existing structures may also occur before the construction of new buildings and structures. The cultural resources that could potentially be affected by ground disturbance activities could include, but are not limited to, prehistoric and historical archaeological sites, paleontological resources, historic buildings, structures, or archaeological sites associated with agriculture and mining, and heritage landscapes. Properties important to Native American communities and other ethnic groups, including tangible properties possessing intangible traditional cultural values, also may exist. Historic buildings and structures may also be adversely affected by demolition-related

activities. Such resources may occur individually, in groupings of modest size, or in districts. Because some historic, archeological, and paleontological resources can also be found or remain within or adjacent to developed areas, these culturally sensitive resources could also be adversely affected by construction of new facilities. Following construction, operation of facilities or infrastructure associated with the compliance responses would not require ground disturbance in addition to that performed during construction and modification because operation activities would occur within the footprint of the constructed or modified facility. Therefore, most operational activities would not have the potential to affect archaeological, paleontological, or historical resources. The presence of new structures or infrastructure may, however, change the visual setting of the surrounding area, which could adversely affect historic resources and districts with an important visual component.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measure 5-1, which identifies existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measure 5-1 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measure 5-1 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the Final EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Geology and Soil Resources

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant short-term construction-related impacts and long-term operational impacts on geology and soil resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce

renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Although it is reasonably foreseeable that construction and operational activities could occur, there is uncertainty as to the exact location of any new facilities or modification of existing facilities. Construction activities could require disturbance of undeveloped areas, such as clearing of vegetation, earth movement and grading, trenching for utility lines, erection of new buildings, and paving of parking lots, delivery areas, and roadways. Additional disturbance could result from the increased mineral ore extraction activities which would provide raw materials to these manufacturing facilities and energy projects. These activities would have the potential to adversely affect soil and geologic resources in construction or mineral ore extraction areas. Long-term operational impacts to geology and soil associated with the Proposed Amendments associated with changes in land use could change soil properties such as erosion potential, quality, and drainage capability.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-2, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-2 are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-2 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the

impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant short-term construction-related impacts on hazards and hazardous material resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Construction activities associated with the Proposed Amendments may require the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Construction activities generally use heavy-duty equipment requiring periodic refueling and lubricating fluids. Large pieces of construction equipment (e.g., backhoes, graders) are typically fueled and maintained at the construction site as they are not designed for use on public roadways. Thus, such maintenance uses a service vehicle that mobilizes to the location of the construction equipment. It is during the transfer of fuel that the potential for an accidental release is most likely. Although precautions would be taken to ensure that any spilled fuel is properly contained and disposed of, and such spills are typically minor and localized to the immediate area of the fueling (or maintenance), the potential remains for a significant release of hazardous materials into the environment. Harmful substances can enter the environment in a number of ways throughout the entire cycle of fuel production, manufacturing, transportation, storage, distribution, usage, and disposal. Implementation of the Proposed Amendments could also increase the production of biofuels. Biofuel processing plants use various hazardous materials to create finished

products. Each plant is responsible for determining if each waste stream is hazardous and managing it appropriately. Additionally, the operation of new and modified carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) facilities could result in the transport, use, and/or disposal of new or higher levels of hazardous chemicals compared to the baseline, depending on the type of facility and carbon capture system present.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measures 9-1 and 9-2, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measures 9-1 and 9-2 are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measures 9-1 and 9-2 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant short-term construction-related impacts and long-term operational impacts on hydrology and water quality resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of

stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Construction activities could require disturbance of undeveloped areas, such as clearing of vegetation, earth movement and grading, trenching for utility lines, erection of new buildings, and paving of parking lots, delivery areas, and roadways. Specific construction projects would be required to comply with applicable erosion, water quality standards, and waste discharge requirements (e.g., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan). With respect to depleting groundwater supplies, impairing quality, and runoff issues, construction of new facilities would not be anticipated to result in substantial demands due to the nature of associated activities. Increasing demand for biofuel crops could still potentially displace production of food crops, resulting in conversion of both fallow and cultivated lands to biofuel feedstock crop production and increasing demands on water resources. Changes in land use associated with biofuel feedstock production are likely to change water demand to support new crop types, depending on the size of the affected area, location, and existing uses. This could result in an increase or decrease in water demand and would be subject to availability and regulatory requirements. Pollutants that result from farming and ranching include sediment, nutrients, pathogens, pesticides, metals, and salts. Impacts from agricultural activities on surface water and ground water can be minimized by using management practices that are adapted to local conditions. An increased use of anaerobic digesters (i.e., dairy digesters, wastewater treatment plants, organic waste digesters) could result in the contamination of local waterways and groundwater resources. Steam power generation facilities, including steam methane reforming to produce hydrogen, have the potential to result in long-term operational waste discharges associated with the steam condensation and cooling operations. CCS actions could result in minor to moderate seismic events, which could cause several centimeters of shift within a fault line. While these events could not be substantial such that damage to humans or structures would occur, brine displacement could result through the formation of leaks within geologic formations. This could result in contamination of groundwater resources. Direct air capture projects could also have potentially significant impacts on hydrologic resources depending on the type, size, and location of these facilities. There could be adverse effects on drainage patterns that could present issues related to erosion or contaminated runoff.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measures 10-1 and 10-2, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measures 10-1 and 10-2

are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measures 10-1 and 10-2 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Land Use and Planning

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant short-term construction-related impacts and long-term operational impacts on land use and planning. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Short-term construction-related

impacts on land use and planning associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments may not be consistent with existing and planned land uses. Additionally, short term agricultural land use changes could result in removal of existing vegetation, immediate loss of natural habitat and subsequent reduction in biodiversity, displacement of agricultural land used for food production, and immediate change to the physiological and hydrological configuration of the existing land due to grading. Construction and operation of new manufacturing, disposal, fuel production and recycling facilities may require the conversion of non-industrial land uses to industrial land uses. With respect to effects related to only land use and planning, the long-term conversion of lands required to meet the upstream demands for fuels to meet the Proposed Amendments could also conflict with local conservation plans or zoning policies. The increased demand could result in continued occurrences of direct land use change due to the expansion of agricultural lands and continued occurrences of indirect expansion of displaced agricultural lands. This could then result in an intensification of adverse effects associated with the conversion or modification of natural land or existing agriculture.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measures 11-1 and 11-2, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measures 11-1 and 11-2 are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measures 11-1 and 11-2 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Mineral Resources

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant long-term operational impacts on mineral resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could

result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Long-term operational compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include increased mining and processing of rare materials used in solar panels, as well as increased mining and processing of metals used as catalysts to produce low-Cl fuels. Depending on the magnitude of required materials, implementation of the Proposed Amendments could affect the availability of known minerals.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measure 12-1, which identifies existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measure 12-1 within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measure 12-1 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Noise

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant short-term construction-related impacts and long-term operational impacts on noise resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Construction noise levels that could result from reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would fluctuate depending on the particular type, number, size, and duration of usage for the varying equipment. The effects of construction noise largely depend on the type of construction activities occurring on any given day, noise levels generated by those activities, distances to noise sensitive receptors, and the existing ambient noise environment in the receptor's vicinity. Construction generally occurs in several discrete stages, each phase requiring a specific complement of equipment with varying equipment type, quantity, and intensity. These variations in the operational characteristics of the equipment change the effect they have on the noise environment of the project site and in the surrounding community for the duration of the construction process. New sources of noise associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could include operation of new facilities, such as truck loading and unloading, biofuel processing plants, carbon capture and storage operations, hydrogen production, fixed guideways; dairy and wastewater treatment anaerobic digesters; installation of new equipment associated with modification to dairies, landfills, and wastewater treatment and oil and gas facilities; and wind farms. Implementation of CCS could include development of direct air capture facilities. The design of future facilities could vary considerably, ranging from tall, multi-story structures to low-profile structures covering a potentially large area of land. Depending on the size of these facilities, intake fans would emit varying degree of noise

that may be substantial depending on the location. Additionally, implementation of the new facilities and projects could introduce new on-site stationary noise sources, including rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment; mechanical equipment (e.g., turbines, engines, pumps, blowers); emergency generators; parking lot activities; loading operations; and other related operational activities.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measures 13-1 and 13-2, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measures 13-1 and 13-2 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measures 13-1 and 13-2 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Transportation

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant short-term construction-related impacts and long-term operational impacts on transportation and traffic resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste

or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Although detailed information about potential specific construction activities is not currently available, it would be anticipated to result in short-term construction traffic (primarily motorized) from worker commute- and material delivery-related trips. Transportation of biomass feedstock such as cellulosic biomass, plant oils, used cooking oils and animal fat, or other materials used in the production of transportation fuels, such as livestock manure or biogas, could result in adverse impacts on transportation and traffic, including traffic congestion, pavement damage, and accidents. Depending on the amount of trip generation and the location of fuel-related deliveries, implementation could conflict with applicable programs, plans, ordinances, or policies (e.g., performance standards, congestion management); and/or result in hazardous design features and emergency access issues from road closures, detours, and obstruction of emergency vehicle movement, especially due to project-generated heavy-duty truck trips. The proposed amendments would likely also increase demand for biomass-based diesel and alternative jet fuel. Historically, these fuels have largely been produced outside of California and imported to the State.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measures 17-1 and 17-2, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measures 17-1 and 17-2 are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measures 17-1 and 17-2 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the CCS Protocol could result in potentially significant long-term operational impacts on tribal cultural resources. Reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the proposed CCS Protocol include The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. The Proposed Amendments could result in construction of manufacturing facilities, production facilities, emission testing facilities, power plants, solar fields, wind turbines, other electricity generation facilities, and infrastructure that would require ground disturbance. In general, construction and ground disturbance activities would occur in areas of compatible zoning (e.g., agricultural). Regardless, there is a possibility that these activities may occur in or adjacent to a region consisting of known significant tribal cultural resources. Therefore, it is foreseeable that known or undocumented tribal cultural resources could be unearthed or otherwise discovered during ground-disturbing and construction activities. Additionally, the presence of new facilities and infrastructure may change the visual setting of the surrounding area, which could adversely affect tribal cultural resources, as determined by a California Native American Tribe.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measure 18-1, which identifies existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measure 18-1 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measure 18-1 should be adopted by

those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the Final EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the CCS Protocol would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Utilities and Service Systems

Finding and Explanation

The Final EIA found that the reasonably foreseeable actions associated with implementation of the Proposed Amendments could result in potentially significant long-term operational impacts on utilities and service systems resources. The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include The reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments include the following responses, which could result in changes to the existing physical environment: modifications to cultivation volume and transport of feedstock; changes to location and types of feedstock; new or modified processing facilities for feedstock and finished fuel production; increased transportation of finished alternative fuels to blending terminals or retail fuel sites; construction and operation of new facilities to produce renewable diesel, renewable gasoline, AJF, and renewable propane; construction of biomass gasification and pyrolysis systems for hydrogen and renewable natural gas production; construction of new anaerobic facilities to digest manure from dairies, sewage from wastewater treatment plants, and organic waste diverted from landfills; construction of infrastructure to collect biogas and produce methane; construction of stand-alone and bolt-on cellulosic processing units for renewable fuels production; increase in collection of yard waste or removal of forest litter and agricultural residues; construction of electrolysis units and substitution of renewable natural gas for fossil gas in production of hydrogen; construction of solar and wind electricity generation projects; modification to existing or new industrial facilities to capture CO₂ emissions; construction of new infrastructure such as pipelines, wells and other surface facilities; construction and operation of additional refueling hydrogen stations and EV charging stations; modifications to electricity distribution and transmission infrastructure; modifications to existing crude production facilities to accommodate solar and wind electricity, solar heat, and/or solar steam generation; electrification of equipment and installation of renewable electricity and battery storage systems at petroleum refineries and alternative fuel production facilities; expansion of public transit systems; and land use changes and changes to fuel-associated shipment patterns. Development of off-site centralized dairy digester facilities could require new water and wastewater treatment facilities or connection to a municipal system. Implementation of the Proposed Amendments would also likely increase the production of hydrogen via

electrolysis. Electrolysis is a process that uses electricity to split water into hydrogen molecules. In addition, new hydrogen pipelines could be constructed to transport hydrogen from the production facilities to end-uses, and could potentially be operated by utilities. New and expanding agricultural activities would potentially result in increased demand on utility and service systems.

The EIA includes Mitigation Measure 19-1, which identify existing statutes and regulations and construction and operating permit requirements, as well as other recognized practices designed to reduce these potentially significant impacts. The Board finds that the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Therefore, the Board finds that the authority to implement Mitigation Measure 19-1 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and that the requirements and practices in Mitigation Measure 19-1 should be adopted by those agencies. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible. Because the authority and responsibility to determine project-level impacts and require project-level mitigation lies with land use and/or permitting agencies for individual projects, and the programmatic level of analysis associated with the EIA does not attempt to address project-specific details of mitigation, the degree of mitigation that may ultimately be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to this resource is inherently uncertain.

Impacts may be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval at a later stage. But at this stage, the Board lacks full details on the design of potential programs and associated required mitigation. Consequently, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the impacts to this resource associated with the proposed actions in the Proposed Amendments would be potentially significant and unavoidable. This impact is overridden by the project's benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Cumulatively Considerable Impacts

The EIA takes a conservative approach and concluded the Proposed Amendments could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts to aesthetics, agriculture and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources (long-term operational-related), noise, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. While suggested mitigation is provided within the respective resource areas of the Final EIA analyses that could address the contribution of the Proposed Amendments to each of these potentially cumulatively considerable impacts, the Board finds that because these adverse impacts are potential indirect impacts associated with the compliance responses, and because CARB lacks general land use or permitting authority, the authority to determine site- or project-specific mitigation is within the purview of jurisdictions with land use approval and permitting authority, such as city or county governments. Public agencies with authority can and should implement the identified measures to the degree feasible.

Consequently, while cumulative impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by land use and/or permitting agency conditions of approval, the Board takes a conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusion and finds the cumulatively

considerable contribution of the Proposed Amendments to existing significant cumulative impacts to aesthetics, agriculture and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources (long-term operational-related), noise, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems to be potentially significant and unavoidable.

Findings on Alternatives to the Project

In addition to the No-Project Alternative, the EIA considered a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that could potentially reduce or eliminate the significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Amendments, while accomplishing most of the project objectives.

The Board finds the alternatives analysis is sufficient to inform the Board and the public regarding the tradeoffs between the degree to which the alternatives could reduce environmental impacts and the corresponding degree to which the alternatives could achieve the project objectives. Further, the Board finds that none of the alternatives discussed in the Final EIA is clearly environmentally superior, and the discussion of the environmental advantages and disadvantages of each alternative in comparison to the proposed scenario is sufficient to inform the Board of alternative options under CEQA.

Based upon a full evaluation of the alternatives, and the entirety of the record, the Board finds that adoption and implementation of the Proposed Amendments is the most desirable, feasible, and appropriate action for achieving the objectives of the project, and the Board rejects the other alternatives as either less desirable or infeasible based on consideration of the relevant factors identified in the EIA and briefly described below:

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Alternative 1 in the EIA describes a reasonably foreseeable scenario if CARB did not approve the Proposed Amendments. The LCFS would continue without strengthening the CI reduction targets beyond 2030, maintaining the existing 2030 CI benchmark by 20% relative to 2010 levels. The ZEV infrastructure crediting provisions would not be expanded to include the medium- and heavy-duty sector. Lastly, Alternative 1 does not phase out the avoided methane crediting or apply a biomethane deliverability requirement. Other CARB programs intended to reduce GHG emissions would continue in accordance with their statutory authorities and adopted regulation.

Implementation of Alternative 1 would avoid some of the potential environmental impacts described in Chapter 4 of the Final EIA, specifically those associated with construction and operation of facilities related to the implementation of specific compliance responses or projects to further reduce the CI value of fuels in California beyond current LCFS targets. If compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments would not occur, California's fuel portfolio would be less likely to change substantially, and the average CI values of fuels, especially for combustion and legacy fleets, would decrease at a slower rate. Thus, potentially significant impacts related to compliance responses that could result in changes in shipment patterns, land use changes, additional infrastructure, and energy demand, and methods used to obtain CI credits could be avoided. However, without

implementation of the Proposed Amendments, GHG reductions within the transportation sector would be substantially impeded compared to reductions associated with the Proposed Amendments. Fossil fuel consumption would be higher under this Alternative than the Proposed Amendments, with all of the accompanying air quality, water quality, land use, energy resource and geological impacts. The beneficial environmental impacts of reduced GHG emissions both before and after 2030 and the air quality co-benefits associated with the LCFS program would not be realized. The State's ability to contribute to the avoidance of the most environmentally damaging impacts of long-term climate change would be limited to benefits achieved in other programs.

The Board finds that the No-Project Alternative would fail to meet many of the project objectives described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIA. Objective 1 of the Proposed Amendments is to improve California's long-term ability to support the production and use of increasingly lower-CI transportation fuels and to improve the program's overall effectiveness. Without updating the annual CI benchmarks through 2030 and strengthening the CI benchmarks post-2030 (objective 2), there would be an oversupply of credits far beyond what is needed for compliance with the CI benchmarks. This oversupply would likely place downward pressure on the value of LCFS credits, reducing the incentive to reduce the CI of fuels, diversify the State's fuel portfolio, or commercialize pathways for new alternative fuels (objective 5). For this reason, the Board rejects this alternative.

Alternative 2: Focused Crediting Scenario

Alternative 2 increases the stringency of the Proposed Project by reducing the scope of the Project to focus on a narrower suite of credit generation opportunities. The differences between the Proposed Amendments and Alternative 2 are:

1. Phase out avoided methane crediting effective January 1, 2025;
2. Apply deliverability requirement to all biomethane effective January 1, 2025, including biomethane used to produce hydrogen; and
3. Eliminate credit generation opportunity for Direct Air Capture (DAC) projects.

Alternative 2 matches the Proposed Amendments with regard to the 2030 carbon intensity target and zero emission vehicle refueling infrastructure crediting.

Alternative 2 would reduce construction and related impacts compared to the Proposed Project, specifically those associated with construction of alternative fuel infrastructure for biomethane projects, anaerobic digestion projects at dairy/swine manure facilities, and DAC projects. This alternative would decrease the rate of deployment of low-carbon fuels, mechanical carbon dioxide removal and carbon capture and sequestration (CCS). Reduced implementation of mechanical carbon dioxide removal and CCS actions would decrease the potential for new facilities to cause long-term aesthetic impacts, direct mortality of birds and bats through collision or capture by intake fans at direct air capture facilities, drawdown of groundwater supplies to support direct air capture facilities, and long-term effects on noise generation and quality of recreation experiences in generally undeveloped areas.

The Board finds Alternative 2 is less effective than the Proposed Amendments at meeting project objectives 1 and 5. The loss of some of the crediting opportunities for low-CI fuel would make it difficult to meet the proposed 90% CI reduction by 2045 target. Direct Air

Capture (DAC) is a key component of CARB's plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and meet carbon neutrality by 2045. Eliminating credits for DAC projects would reduce one of the key incentives to deploy this technology and jeopardizes the feasibility of achieving California's long-term decarbonization targets and the 2045 carbon intensity target proposed under this project. Compliance with the regulation is difficult without direct air capture, so this scenario risks creating demand for credits that exceeds available supply beyond 2030. Alternative 2 is also not responsive to the direction in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update, as capturing methane from dairies is one of the primary measures for achieving the State's 2045 greenhouse gas reduction targets and SB 1383 methane reduction target. Ending avoided methane crediting in 2025 could stop the development of new anaerobic digester projects as the credits incentivize investment in upfront capital costs. The loss of these credits may also cause operating digestors to shut down if the operational expense is greater than the value of the gas and other incentives received by the project developers. Without anaerobic digesters, California would not be able to meet its 2030 dairy and livestock sector methane emissions reduction goal. The more stringent deliverability requirements for out-of-state biomethane and elimination of avoided methane credits could limit the diversification of the state's fuel portfolio and the use of increasingly lower-CI transportation fuels (objective 1), increase the State's dependence on fossil fuels (objective 5), and reduce investments in alternative fuel production and fueling infrastructure (objective 3). Biomethane provides substantial decarbonization potential in the near term, particularly for natural gas vehicles, while zero emission vehicle deployment continues to increase in market share. Without biomethane, more fossil natural gas is required to meet the demand of natural gas vehicles. Also, eliminating book and claim for biomethane used to produce hydrogen may unduly restrict the development of the hydrogen supply California needs in order to displace fossil fuels, identified in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update. Fossil fuel consumption would be higher under this Alternative than the Proposed Amendments, with all of the accompanying air quality, water quality, land use, energy resource and geological impacts. For these reasons, the Board rejects this alternative.

Alternative 3: Reduce Project Stringency by Lowering Carbon Intensity Reduction Target to 25% in 2030

Alternative 3 describes an alternative that would be less stringent than the Proposed Amendments. Alternative 3 includes all the proposed amendments described in Chapter 2.0 of the Final EIA but reduces the carbon intensity (CI) reduction target to 25% by 2030 instead of the 30% CI reduction target proposed by CARB staff. The scenario still achieves a 90% CI reduction by 2045.

Implementation of Alternative 3 would reduce the potential environmental impacts described in Chapter 4.0 of the Final EIA. The reduced impacts would be in the resource areas that are already impacted by LCFS, including aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soil, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic due to short-term construction-related processes as well as, in some instances, long-term operational processes. Additionally, alternative 3 has fewer beneficial impacts than the Proposed Amendments. While there would be less near-term construction-related emissions due to the slower buildout of new fuel production infrastructure, there would also be fewer beneficial impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions in the long-term because of the lower volume of low-CI fuels used. Compared to the Proposed Amendments, Alternative 3 would include a significant decrease in NOx emission benefits and in PM2.5

emission benefits, and substantially less long-term GHG emission reductions. Fossil fuel consumption would be higher under Alternative 3 than the Proposed Amendments, with all of the accompanying air quality, water quality, land use, energy resource and geological impacts.

The Board finds this alternative is less effective than the Proposed Amendments at meeting project objectives 2, 3 and 5. This Alternative would decrease the rate of deployment of low-carbon fuels in the near-term and development of alternative fuel infrastructure. Compliance responses for this alternative are expected to be the same types as those for the Proposed Amendments, except that the compliance responses would be less frequent and occur over a longer time period. For these reasons, the Board rejects this alternative.

Alternatives Considered but Rejected

The Final EIA also includes an additional alternative that was considered but rejected from meeting the criteria for undergoing a full alternatives analysis under CEQA. The CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) includes three factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR: “i. failure to meet most of the basic project objectives; ii. Infeasibility, or iii. Inability to avoid significant environmental impact.” As this alternative did not meet these factors detailed consideration was not provided in the Final EIA. The alternative considered but rejected is: 40% CI Reduction Stringency in 2030 and Maximum Crediting Opportunities. For a more detailed discussion of the alternative considered but rejected, please see the Final EIA (as incorporated by reference).

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CARB expects that many of the significant adverse impacts identified in the Final EIA will be avoided or mitigated; however, because uncertainty exists as to the extent of mitigation that other agencies will require at the site- and project-specific level, the Board is conservatively considering the impacts to be significant and unavoidable. The Board finds that despite the potential for adverse environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Amendments, other benefits of this regulatory action are determined to be overriding considerations that warrant approval of the proposed regulations and outweigh and override its unavoidable significant impacts. These benefits include:

1. Reduction in the CI of transportation fuels in the California market by at least 30 percent of its 2010 level by 2030 in-line with California’s 2030 GHG reduction requirement enacted through Senate Bill (SB) 32 (Pavley, 2016), and 90 percent of its 2010 level by 2045, thereby benefitting the environment for current and future generations;
2. Reducing GHG emissions in the largest sector, transportation, which accounts for approximately 50 percent of the State’s GHG emissions;
3. Greater diversification of the state’s fuel portfolio in subsequent years;
4. Reduction in both the State’s dependence on petroleum and the associated economic impacts of gasoline and diesel price spikes caused by volatile oil price changes;

5. Significant reduction in carcinogenic particulate matter emissions by replacing petroleum diesel fuel with biodiesel and renewable diesel, both of which yield less particulate matter when combusted in heavy-duty engines compared to petroleum diesel.
6. Stimulating greater innovation and development of cleaner, lower-carbon transportation fuels;
7. Providing additional, cost-effective LCFS compliance options;
8. Supporting California's ongoing efforts to address climate change and ambient air quality through 2045, consistent with the 2022 Scoping Plan Update and State Implementation Plan, thereby enhancing public health and the environment.

LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which these findings are based are at 1001 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814. The custodian for these documents is the California Air Resources Board Legal Office, inquiries can be submitted to CaliforniaEnvironmentalQualityAct@arb.ca.gov.