

Strengthening the Voice of Business Since 2008

eFed's Mon.

A - Los Angeles
irines for America
Ihambra Chamber
Ihambra Chamber
Interior Hold Resociation
Interior Hotel & Lodging Association
Intelope Valley Board of Trade
Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles
Arament Association of Greater Los Angeles
American Business Women Association

American Business Women Association

American House Association

Am BizFed's Member Alliance Action Apartment Association everly Hills / Greater LA Association of Realtors
WASUCCESS
whank Association of Realtors
without for the Management of Realtors
wilding Industry Association, IA / Ventura Counties
wilding Industry Association, IA / Ventura Counties
wilding Industry Association, IA / Wentura Counties
wilding Industry Association (A Perparedness
JASIAN CHARLES PRESENTED ASSOCIATION (A PERPARED ASSOCIATION IN INTERPRETATION California Spotter.
California Tucking Association.
California Tucking Association.
California Tucking Association.
California Tucking Association California
CDC Small Business Finance
Central City Association of Commerce
Central City Association of Realtors
Central City Association of Realtors
Construction Industry Air and Water Quality Coalitions
Consumer Healthcare Products Association
Culver City Chamber
Culver City Chamber

**Construction of Realtors
Culver City Chamber

**Construction of Realtors
Culver City Chamber

**Construction of Realtors

**Con pioyers Group gineering Contractor's Association A.S.T.-Fixing Angelenos Stuck In Traffic reign Trade Association turePorts ab l Area Chamber for Urban Renewal Network adena-roomina Access
RMA
nned Parenthood Southern California Affiliates iona Chamber cho Southeast Association of Realtors ording Industry Association of America ional Black - San Fernando Valley Cham ional San Gabriel Valley Chamber ional Biace, sour. Valley Chamber
ional Sin Gabriel Valley Chamber
ary Club of Los Angeles
Gabriel Chamber
Gabriel Valley Edition
to Carriel Valley Edition
to Carriel Valley Edition
to Chamber Chamber
to Charita Valley Edition
to Chamber
ta Monica Chamber
ta Monica Chamber
ta Monica Chamber
Vie La Maria Valley Common Covening
to Chamber
Vie La Monica Chamber
Vie La Monica Chamber A Oaks Chamber of Commer y Association of Chambers y Association of Realtors without a natural is Contractor. Association student a latin and a second a second

May 21, 2018

Mr. Wayne Nastri Executive Officer South Coast Air Quality Management District 21865 Copley Drive Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Dear Mr. Nastri,

We appreciate the South Coast Air Quality Management District's ("SCAQMD" or "District") response to the comment letter that BizFed members submitted on March 15, 2018. These additional comments are in response to the District's April 25, 2018 response letter and made on behalf of BizFed members who own and operate facilities that comprise most of the Regional Clean Air Incentives Market ("RECLAIM") program. The District's response inappropriately relies upon evaluations of environmental impacts based on the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") and more specifically, CMB-05. While the Final Program Environmental Impact Report ("Final Program EIR") and the Final Socioeconomic Report ("Socioeconomic Report") did both analyze the overall implementation of CMB-05, the analysis failed to assess the sunset of and rules to transition out of RECLAIM ("RECLAIM Transition Project"), the associated rulemakings and its other associated components.

1. The District's assessment of CMB-05 in the Final Program EIR for the 2016 AQMP does not include an analysis of the RECLAIM Transition Project and, therefore, a detailed environmental assessment should be conducted regarding the entire Project.

As stated in our initial March 15th letter, we believe the District is not fully complying with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and needs to prepare an environmental assessment that considers the entire RECLAIM Transition Project across impacted facilities and equipment. In its April 25th response letter, the District argues that that the RECLAIM Transition Project was already analyzed in the 2016 AQMP and associated Final Program EIR, due to the inclusion of CMB-05 in the analysis. However, CMB-05 is a general directive (stemming from the 2016 AQMP) and the RECLAIM Transition Project was not even in existence when either CMB-05 or the Final Program EIR was drafted.

While the Final Program EIR for the 2016 AQMP determined the impacts related to the implementation of CMB-05, CMB-05 merely sets forth the general concept of "further NOx reductions from RECLAIM assessment." (2016 AQMP Final Program EIR ("Final Program EIR") (January 2017) p. 2-17.) CMB-05 specifically notes that as a control measure, it "identifies a series of approaches that can be explored to make the RECLAIM program more effective." (Emphasis added. Final Program EIR at p. 4.1-27.) Neither CMB-05 nor its analysis in the Final Program EIR addresses potentially sunsetting the RECLAIM program or the impacts related to doing so. In fact, none of the CMBs specifically anticipate sunsetting the RECLAIM program. For example, while control measures like CMB-01 proposed to transition stationary sources to zero and near-zero emission technologies, these general concepts lack

many of the specificities set forth in the RECLAIM program, which are needed to conduct a proper CEQA analysis. Furthermore, the District could not have evaluated the RECLAIM Transition Project in the Final Program EIR, as the Project had not been designed when the Final Program EIR was drafted and certified, let alone when CMB-05 or any of the CMBs were created in the years prior.

More specifically, the District states in its response that CMB-05 had an expectation that there would be a 5 tpd NOx emission reduction as soon as feasible "but no later than 2025." (SCAQMD Response Letter (April 25, 2018) p. 1.) However, the District failed to mention that the AQMP analyses relied upon an implementation date of 2031. The amendment to accelerate the date to 2025 was not introduced until the final hearing for the adoption of the 2016 AQMP, long after the impacts had been analyzed. Therefore, no staff analysis was performed relating to the variety of impacts deriving from this accelerated timeline (i.e. concentrated construction emissions, resource constraints, or additional costs) and the reliance on the 2016 AQMP Final Program EIR remains improper.

Additionally, we believe the District's evaluation of each individual RECLAIM Transition rule is improper and could be considered piecemealing. We do agree with the District that streamlined environmental review pursuant to a Program EIR is expressly allowed under CEQA. (14 CCR § 15168.) However, as explained above, the RECLAIM Transition Program was in fact not evaluated under the Program EIR. Because of this lack of complete assessment, the District reviewing the Project's rules in a fragmented manner may be considered piecemealing, which is specifically forbidden by CEQA. (*Bozung v. Local Agency Formation Com.* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 263, 283-284 [the California Supreme Court found it was inappropriate to divide a project into segments to avoid preparing an EIR].) There are concerns with dividing a project into small segments, as it allows lead agencies to minimize apparent environmental impacts of a project by evaluating individual pieces separately. These individual pieces each may seem to have a less-than-significant impact on the environment, but in actuality when evaluated together, they may result in a significant impact.

BizFed remains concerned that this lack of proper CEQA analysis will cause unforeseen impacts. For example, many facilities will be subject to more than one landing rule, with associated implementation deadlines in Rule 1100 that will be amended with each landing rule. These implementation deadlines are bound to overlap, causing unforeseen impacts that were not analyzed in the 2016 AQMP or its associated Program EIR. Additionally, for the NOx reductions on heaters and boilers, selective catalytic reduction ("SCR") is usually the Best Available Retrofit Control Technology ("BARCT"). SCRs often require the use of ammonia and may increase particulate matter ("PM") emissions. As such, the potential use of SCRs may result in environmental impacts that have not been previously analyzed and need to be considered under CEQA.

As it currently stands, the District is evaluating the Reclaim Transition rulemakings in small segments, which we believe is in improper. At this time, the Project includes 14 proposed rules and amendments, several of which are completely new rules and were never thought of during the AQMP process. This overall group of RECLAIM Transition rulemakings needs to be collectively considered under CEQA and the Project should not be adopted and facilities should not be removed from RECLAIM until the District has completed a CEQA assessment for the entire Project.

2. The District's assessment of CMB-05 in the Final Socioeconomic Report for the 2016 AQMP does not include an analysis of the RECLAIM Transition Project and, therefore, socioeconomic impacts for the entire Project should be analyzed.

BizFed also believes that the District still needs to evaluate the socioeconomic impacts of the RECLAIM Transition Project and that the socioeconomic analysis should not be piecemealed across rule-level assessments. The District's April 25th response letter argues that the Socioeconomic Report for the 2016 AQMP fully analyzed the socioeconomic impacts for the 2016 AQMP and claims this includes the RECLAIM Transition Project. The District states that the Report relies on CMB-05 to analyze the socioeconomic impacts, but as discussed above, CMB-05 was a general directive and did not include the specificities the RECLAIM Transition Project and its rulemakings set forth. The District is required to conduct a socioeconomic assessment of the impacts related to the adoption, amendment, or repeal of a rule or regulation. (Health & Saf. Code § 40440.8(a).) BizFed has not yet seen the District's draft socioeconomic assessment for any of the proposed rules for the RECLAIM Transition Project and continues to request that the District conduct a socioeconomic assessment that considers the effects of the overall Project.

In summary, we maintain that the District still needs to prepare an environmental assessment and socioeconomic assessment that considers the environmental and socioeconomic effects of the entire RECLAIM Transition Project. Due to the issues that remain, any scheduled or proposed hearing should be delayed until these issues have been adequately addressed. Furthermore, the appropriate environmental and socioeconomic assessments should be completed to support any rule adoptions prior to the District transitioning individual RECLAIM facilities out of the program.

Thank you for considering BizFed's comments on this matter. Our coalition and its members look forward to continuing dialogue and working with the District on the RECLAIM Transition Project.

Sincerely,

Hilary Norton BizFed Chair

Fixing Angelenos

Stuck in Traffic (F.A.S.T)

David Fleming BizFed Founding Chair Tracy Hernandez BizFed Founding CEO Impower, Inc.