
**APPENDIX A NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) AND
SCOPING MEETING MATERIALS**

***APPENDIX A1 NOTICE OF PREPARATION
(NOP) AND NOP COMMENT
LETTERS***



CITY OF CARSON

April 16, 2021

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NOTICE OF SCOPING MEETING

Pursuant to a request by the Carson Reclamation Authority (CRA), a California joint powers authority, the City of Carson (City) will be considering an amendment to The District at South Bay Specific Plan, which was previously adopted by the City in 2018 (the 2018 Specific Plan) for the property formerly known as the Cal-Compact Landfill, located at 20400 E. Main Street, Carson, CA, consisting of 157 acres (the 157 Acre Site). The CRA and City have agreed that the City shall serve as the lead agency in connection with the required environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for a new project that has been proposed by a developer, Carson Goose Owner, LLC, within a 96 acre portion of the 157 Acre Site (also referred to as 2021 Project). The 2021 Project will require an amendment to the 2018 Specific Plan (the 2021 Specific Plan Amendment)

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163 (14 C.C.R. Section 1500 et seq.), the City has determined that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) is required to be prepared to analyze the environmental impacts of the 2021 Project (the 2021 SEIR). The 2021 SEIR will analyze the amendment to the Specific Plan as a whole, though only 96 acres of the entire 157 Acre Site is proposed to be changed by the 2021 Specific Plan Amendment). The project location and project description are further described below.

PROJECT NAME: The District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment

PRIOR EIR/PRIOR APPROVALS: The 157 Acre Site was previously analyzed for development pursuant to: (1) a Final Environmental Impact Report for the Carson Marketplace Specific Plan (SCH No. 2005051059), which was certified by the City of Carson on February 8, 2006 (2006 FEIR); (2) Addendum 1 to the 2006 FEIR, which was approved in March 2009; and (3) a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, which was certified by the City on April 3, 2018 (2018 SEIR). In connection with these prior environmental studies, the Carson Marketplace Specific Plan was amended and renamed The District at South Bay Specific Plan, which was approved by the City on April 3, 2018 in connection with the 2018 SEIR.

PROJECT LOCATION/ADDRESS: The 157 Acre Site is located at 20400 E. Main Street in the City of Carson. The 157 Acre Site is in the South Bay area of Los Angeles County, west of the San Diego Freeway (I-405), south of Del Amo Boulevard, and north of the Avalon Boulevard interchange with the I-405. The boundaries of the 2021 Specific Plan Amendment are the same as in the 2018 Specific Plan, including the 11 acre property adjacent to the 157 Acre Site, just north of Del Amo Boulevard, which is currently developed with the Evolve South Bay multi-family complex.

The 157 Acre Site is currently undeveloped, but was used as a landfill site between approximately 1959 and 1965, prior to the incorporation of the City of Carson, for the deposition of waste/refuse from areas throughout Los Angeles County. The 157 Acre Site has been subject to remediation activities, which has resulted in the creation of crushed concrete piles, detention and retention ponds, a groundwater treatment plant, and a gas plant extraction facility. Figure 1, Project Site, depicts the location of the 157 Acre Site for purposes of the CEQA analysis, as well as the boundary of the 2018 and 2021 Specific Plan area.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The City, as lead agency, is proposing to prepare a 2021 SEIR to evaluate the changes proposed by the 2021 Project to The District at South Bay Specific Plan.

The 157 Acre Site is divided into three planning areas under the 2018 Specific Plan, as depicted by Figure 2, Planning Areas. The 2021 Specific Plan Amendment would retain the same land uses adopted by the City under 2018 Specific Plan for Planning Areas 1 and 2, including residential (1,250 units), regional commercial (696,500 square feet), and restaurant (15,000 square feet). The revisions to the 2021 Project would occur entirely within Planning Area 3 of the Specific Plan, which is proposed to introduce new light industrial uses, along with up to approximately 12 acres of community serving uses to be known as the “Carson Country Mart”, including an activated commercial / retail area with privately maintained, publicly accessible passive and active open space areas. The Carson Country Mart’s commercial component will include pet related retail, restaurants with a drive-thru component, food and beverage kiosks, and amenity areas.

More specifically, in PA3, the 2021 Project would provide approximately 1,567,090 square feet of light industrial uses (with ancillary office spaces serving the light industrial facility), including fulfillment center / ecommerce uses and distribution center or parcel hub type uses, within six buildings (Buildings A-F). The Carson Country Mart would consist of approximately 33,800 square feet of commercial uses, including approximately 10,000 square feet of retail space catered to pets and animals; 12,600 square feet for up to four restaurants (a gourmet or upscale drive-thru and pickup restaurants/facilities), approximately 9,000 square feet of flexible food and beverage kiosks, and a 2,200 square foot cafe. In addition, the Carson Country Mart would consist of approximately 6.29 acres of passive and active publicly accessible but privately maintained open

space and amenity areas. The proposed site plan for the 2021 Project is provided in Figure 3, 2021 Project – Proposed Site Plan.

In total, the 2021 Specific Plan Amendment would consist of approximately 2,312,390 square feet of light industrial, regional commercial, neighborhood-serving commercial/retail, restaurant/cafe, restaurants with a drive-thru component, and food and beverage kiosks. Overall, with these proposed modifications, the square footage proposed for development under the 2021 Specific Plan Amendment would increase the square footage of development on the 157 Acre Site under the approved 2018 Specific Plan, from 1,834,833 square feet to 2,312,390 square feet. The residential units would remain at 1,250 units.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: As previously mentioned, the prior projects proposed on the 157 Acre Site (including in 2006 and in 2018) were extensively environmentally assessed and EIRs for such projects have been certified. Both of those environmental documents retain significant informational value, especially given that no changes are proposed to be made to a large portion of the previously-studied 2018 Specific Plan project area. The purpose of the 2021 SEIR is to assess the proposed modifications and updates to the previously approved 2018 Specific Plan to determine if: (1) there are new significant effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects that were not previously evaluated in the 2006 FEIR or 2018 SEIR; or (2) if mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible are now feasible or are considerably different from those previously analyzed that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects and the project proponents decline to adopt them. In conducting this analysis, the 2021 SEIR will rely on information provided in the 2018 SEIR and/or 2006 FEIR. In this regard, the 2021 SEIR will supplement the 2006 FEIR and 2018 SEIR by evaluating potential impacts related to the following environmental issues: Aesthetics, Air Quality (including a Health Risk Assessment), Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service Systems.

The Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Mineral Resources, and Wildfire issues will not be evaluated in the 2021 SEIR as the 157 Acre Site was a former land fill in a heavily developed area of the City of Carson. No agricultural or forestry land uses have or are currently present on the 157 Acre Site. In addition, no drilling has or currently occurs on the 157 Acre Site and development of the 2021 Project would not cause a loss of access to mineral resources. Furthermore, the 157 Acre Site is not located in or near any State Responsibility Areas or lands classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Therefore, no impacts would occur as it relates to agriculture and forestry resources, mineral resources, and wildfires.

COMMENTING ON THE SCOPE OF THE SEIR: In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, the City has prepared this Notice of Preparation to provide the public, nearby residences and property owners, responsible agencies, and other interested parties with information regarding the Project and its potential environmental effects. The City will consider all written comments regarding the scope and content of the environmental information within the 2021 SEIR to the lead agency no later than 30 days after receipt of this Notice of Preparation. The review period is from **April 16, 2021 to May 17, 2021**. Please send your comments directly to:

City of Carson, Planning Department
Attn: Gena Guisar, Planner
701 E Carson St, Carson, CA Carson,
California 90745
Email: gguisar@carsonca.gov
Fax: (310) 952-1761 ext. 1323


DUE DATE FOR COMMENTS: **May 17, 2021** comments due by 5:00 PM PST

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING: This Project is considered a project of statewide, regional, or area wide significant pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15206 as it will require a general plan amendment and the proposed industrial uses encompass more than 650,000 square feet of industrial uses. Therefore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082(c)(1), the City will be holding a virtual public scoping meeting at **5:00 PM, April 29, 2021**, via the Zoom webinar link below. Governor's Executive Order N-25-20 allows local governments to hold meetings via teleconferencing while still meeting state transparency requirements. Therefore, the Project's public scoping meeting will be held online, through an online format.


Scoping Meeting Date and Time: April 29, 2021 at 5:00 PM PST

Zoom Registration Link: <http://bit.ly/DistrictSBScopingMeeting>

The public scoping meeting will provide an opportunity to receive and disseminate information and discuss the scope of review to be included in the 2021 SEIR. The scoping meeting is not a public hearing, and no decisions on the 2021 Project will be made at this meeting. It is an opportunity for agencies and the general public to provide input on what issues should be addressed in the 2021 SEIR. All public agencies, organizations, and interested parties, including nearby residents and business owners, are encouraged to attend and participate in this meeting.



- Specific Plan Boundary (168 acres)
- Planning Area 1
- 2021 Project Site Boundary (157 acres)
- Planning Area 2
- Planning Area 3
- Development District 3 Boundary (11 acres)
- Torrance Lateral Drainage Canal



Note: this is a graphic representation of a planning concept. All graphics in this document are conceptual and should not be interpreted literally. Other solutions, locations and/or concepts may be proposed and reviewed during site plan review and other permit and mapping processes.

D:\160573_10 - The District SEIR Addendum\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: ESA, 2021

The District at South Bay

Figure 2
Planning Areas





SOURCE: RGA, 2021

The District at South Bay

Figure 3
2021 Project - Proposed Site Plan



NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

April 20, 2021

Governor's Office of Planning & Research

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
701 East Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745

Apr 23 2021

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Re: 2005051059, The District at South Bay Specific Plan Project, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Guisar:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) or Early Consultation for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code §21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code §21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit.14, §15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b))). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code §21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 5064 subd.(a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines §15064 (a)(1))). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources within the area of potential effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, "tribal cultural resources" (Pub. Resources Code §21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.3 (a)). **AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation, a notice of negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015.** If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). **Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements.** If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. §800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments.

Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.



CHAIRPERSON
Laura Miranda
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON
Reginald Pagaling
Chumash

SECRETARY
Merri Lopez-Keifer
Luiseño

PARLIAMENTARIAN
Russell Attebery
Karuk

COMMISSIONER
William Mungary
Paiute/White Mountain
Apache

COMMISSIONER
Julie Tumamait-Stenslie
Chumash

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Christina Snider
Pomo

NAHC HEADQUARTERS
1550 Harbor Boulevard
Suite 100
West Sacramento,
California 95691
(916) 373-3710
nahc@nahc.ca.gov
NAHC.ca.gov

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

- 1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project:** Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:
 - a.** A brief description of the project.
 - b.** The lead agency contact information.
 - c.** Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d)).
 - d.** A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21073).

- 2. Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe's Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report:** A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1, subs. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (b)).
 - a.** For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code §65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (b)).

- 3. Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe:** The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:
 - a.** Alternatives to the project.
 - b.** Recommended mitigation measures.
 - c.** Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).

- 4. Discretionary Topics of Consultation:** The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:
 - a.** Type of environmental review necessary.
 - b.** Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
 - c.** Significance of the project's impacts on tribal cultural resources.
 - d.** If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).

- 5. Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process:** With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code §6254 (r) and §6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (c)(1)).

- 6. Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document:** If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency's environmental document shall discuss both of the following:
 - a.** Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
 - b.** Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (b)).

- 7. Conclusion of Consultation:** Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
- a.** The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
 - b.** A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (b)).
- 8. Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document:** Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (a)).
- 9. Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation:** If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (e)).
- 10. Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:**
- a.** Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
 - i.** Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
 - ii.** Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
 - b.** Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - i.** Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
 - ii.** Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
 - iii.** Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
 - c.** Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
 - d.** Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code §21084.3 (b)).
 - e.** Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code §815.3 (c)).
 - f.** Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code §5097.991).
- 11. Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource:** An Environmental Impact Report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
- a.** The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 and §21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2.
 - b.** The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
 - c.** The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC's PowerPoint presentation titled, "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices" may be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf

SB 18

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code §65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf.

Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. **Tribal Consultation:** If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.** (Gov. Code §65352.3 (a)(2)).
2. **No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation.** There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.
3. **Confidentiality:** Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code §65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code §5097.9 and §5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction. (Gov. Code §65352.3 (b)).
4. **Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation:** Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
 - a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
 - b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and "Sacred Lands File" searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: <http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/>.

NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
 - a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
 - b. If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
 - c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
 - d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
 - a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
 - b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.

3. Contact the NAHC for:
 - a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project's APE.
 - b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.

4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
 - a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
 - b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
 - c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address:
Andrew.Green@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Andrew Green
Cultural Resources Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse



May 6, 2021

Ref. DOC 6149954

Ms. Gena Guisar, Planner
Planning Department
City of Carson
701 East Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745

Dear Ms. Guisar:

NOP Response for The District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment

The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (Districts) received a Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (NOP) for the subject project on April 20, 2021. The proposed project is located within the jurisdictional boundary of District No. 8. We offer the following comments regarding sewerage service:

1. The Districts maintain sewerage facilities within the project area that may be affected by the proposed project. Approval to construct improvements within a Districts' sewer easement and/or over or near a Districts' sewer is required before construction may begin. For a copy of the Districts' buildover procedures and requirements go to www.lacsd.org, under Services, then Wastewater Program and Permits and select Buildover Procedures. For more specific information regarding the buildover procedure, please contact Ms. Danielle Thomas at (562) 908-4288, extension 2754.
2. The wastewater flow originating from a portion of the proposed project site will discharge directly to the Districts' Del Amo Replacement Trunk Sewer, located in Del Amo Boulevard east of Main Street. The Districts' 42-inch diameter trunk sewer has a capacity of 10.8 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 2.9 mgd when last measured in 2015. A 6-inch diameter or smaller direct connection to a Districts' trunk sewer requires a Trunk Sewer Connection Permit issued by the Districts. An 8-inch diameter or larger direct connection to a Districts' trunk sewer requires submittal of Sewer Plans for review and approval by the Districts. For additional information, please contact the Districts' Engineering Counter at engineeringcounter@lacsd.org or (562) 908-4288, extension 1205.
3. The remaining wastewater flow originating from the proposed project site will discharge to a local sewer line, which is not maintained by the Districts, for conveyance to the Districts' Main Street Relief Trunk Sewer, located in Main Street at Jim Dear Boulevard. The Districts' 42-inch diameter trunk sewer has a capacity of 20.2 mgd and conveyed a peak flow of 3.9 mgd when last measured in 2016.
4. The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant located in the City of Carson, which has a capacity of 400 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 259.6 mgd.
5. The expected increase in average wastewater flow from the project site, described in the document as 1,250 residential units along with a combined total of 2,312,390 square feet of mixed-use light industrial, commercial, and restaurant uses, is 945,527 gallons per day, after the structures on the project site are demolished. For a copy of the Districts' average wastewater generation factors, go to www.lacsd.org, under

Services, then Wastewater Program and Permits, select Will Serve Program, and scroll down to click on the [Table 1, Loadings for Each Class of Land Use](#) link.

6. The Districts are empowered by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee to connect facilities (directly or indirectly) to the Districts' Sewerage System or to increase the strength or quantity of wastewater discharged from connected facilities. This connection fee is a capital facilities fee that is used by the Districts to upgrade or expand the Sewerage System. Payment of a connection fee may be required before this project is permitted to discharge to the Districts' Sewerage System. For more information and a copy of the Connection Fee Information Sheet, go to www.lacsd.org, under Services, then Wastewater (Sewage) and select Rates & Fees. In determining the impact to the Sewerage System and applicable connection fees, the Districts will determine the user category (e.g. Condominium, Single Family home, etc.) that best represents the actual or anticipated use of the parcel(s) or facilities on the parcel(s) in the development. For more specific information regarding the connection fee application procedure and fees, the developer should contact the Districts' Wastewater Fee Public Counter at (562) 908-4288, extension 2727.
7. In order for the Districts to conform to the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), the capacities of the Districts' wastewater treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Specific policies included in the development of the SCAG regional growth forecast are incorporated into clean air plans, which are prepared by the South Coast and Antelope Valley Air Quality Management Districts in order to improve air quality in the South Coast and Mojave Desert Air Basins as mandated by the CCA. All expansions of Districts' facilities must be sized and service phased in a manner that will be consistent with the SCAG regional growth forecast for the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. The available capacity of the Districts' treatment facilities will, therefore, be limited to levels associated with the approved growth identified by SCAG. As such, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of wastewater service, but is to advise the developer that the Districts intend to provide this service up to the levels that are legally permitted and to inform the developer of the currently existing capacity and any proposed expansion of the Districts' facilities.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2717 or at araza@lacsd.org.

Very truly yours,



Adriana Raza
Customer Service Specialist
Facilities Planning Department

AR:ar

cc: D. Thomas
A. Schmidt
A. Howard



South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178
(909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov

SENT VIA E-MAIL:

gguisar@carsonca.gov

Gena Guisar, Planner
City of Carson, Planning Department
701 East Carson Street
Carson, California 90745

May 11, 2021

Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment (Proposed Project)

South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. Our comments are recommendations on the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the Proposed Project that should be included in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Please send a copy of the Supplemental EIR upon its completion and public release directly to South Coast AQMD as copies of the Supplemental EIR submitted to the State Clearinghouse are not forwarded. **In addition, please send all appendices and technical documents related to the air quality, health risk, and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all emission calculation spreadsheets, and air quality modeling and health risk assessment input and output files (not PDF files). Any delays in providing all supporting documentation for our review will require additional review time beyond the end of the comment period.**

Responsible Agency and South Coast AQMD Permits

South Coast AQMD is a Responsible Agency for the Proposed Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15381) since implementation of some components of the Proposed Project requires permits from South Coast AQMD. It is important to note that the assumptions in the air quality analysis in the Final Supplemental EIR will be used as the basis for evaluating the permits under CEQA and imposing permit conditions and limits. In order to ensure that impacts from the permits are fully and adequately evaluated as required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15096(b), it is recommended that the Lead Agency initiate consultation with South Coast AQMD. Questions on permits should be directed to South Coast AQMD's Engineering and Permitting staff at (909) 396-3385.

CEQA Air Quality Analysis

Staff recommends that the Lead Agency use South Coast AQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and website¹ as guidance when preparing the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses. It is also recommended that the Lead Agency use the CalEEMod² land use emissions software, which can estimate pollutant emissions from typical land use development and is the only software model maintained by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association.

South Coast AQMD has developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. South Coast AQMD staff recommends that the Lead Agency quantify criteria pollutant emissions and compare the emissions to South Coast AQMD's CEQA regional pollutant emissions significance thresholds³ and

¹ South Coast AQMD's CEQA Handbook and other resources for preparing air quality analyses can be found at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook>.

² CalEEMod is available free of charge at: www.caleemod.com.

³ South Coast AQMD's CEQA regional pollutant emissions significance thresholds can be found at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf>.

localized significance thresholds (LSTs)⁴ to determine the Proposed Project's air quality impacts. The localized analysis can be conducted by either using the LST screening tables or performing dispersion modeling.

The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the Proposed Project and all air pollutant sources related to the Proposed Project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips, and hauling trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers and air pollution control devices), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, such as sources that generate or attract vehicular trips, should be included in the analysis. Furthermore, emissions from the overlapping construction and operational activities should be combined and compared to South Coast AQMD's regional air quality CEQA *operational* thresholds to determine the level of significance.

If the Proposed Project generates diesel emissions from long-term construction or attracts diesel-fueled vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, it is recommended that the Lead Agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment⁵.

Sensitive receptors are people that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants and include schools, daycare centers, nursing homes, elderly care facilities, hospitals, and residential dwelling units. The Proposed Project will include, among others, 1,250 residential units and is located in close proximity to Interstate 405, and to facilitate the purpose of an EIR as an informational document, it is recommended that the Lead Agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment⁵ to disclose the potential health risks⁶.

The California Air Resources Board's (CARB) *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*⁷ is a general reference guide for evaluating and reducing air pollution impacts associated with new projects that go through the land use decision-making process with additional guidance on strategies to reduce air pollution exposure near high-volume roadways available in CARB's technical advisory⁸.

South Coast AQMD staff is concerned about potential public health impacts of siting warehouses within close proximity of sensitive land uses, especially in communities that are already heavily affected by the existing warehouse and truck activities. The South Coast AQMD's Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study (MATES IV), completed in May 2015, concluded that the largest contributor to cancer risk from air pollution is diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions⁹. According to the MATES IV Carcinogenic Risk interactive Map, the area surrounding the Proposed Project has an estimated cancer risk over 1,200 in one

⁴ South Coast AQMD's guidance for performing a localized air quality analysis can be found at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/localized-significance-thresholds>.

⁵ South Coast AQMD's guidance for performing a mobile source health risk assessment can be found at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/mobile-source-toxics-analysis>.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ CARB's *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* can be found at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf>.

⁸ CARB's technical advisory can be found at: <https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm>.

⁹ South Coast AQMD. May 2015. *Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study in the South Coast Air Basin*. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/air-quality/air-toxic-studies/mates-iv/mates-iv-final-draft-report-4-1-15.pdf>.

million¹⁰. Operation of warehouses generates and attracts heavy-duty diesel-fueled trucks that emit DPM. When the health impacts from the Proposed Project are added to those existing impacts, residents living in the communities surrounding the Proposed Project will possibly face an even greater exposure to air pollution and bear a disproportionate burden of increasing health risks.

Mitigation Measures

In the event that the Proposed Project results in significant adverse air quality impacts, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by law be utilized to minimize these impacts. Any impacts resulting from mitigation measures must also be analyzed. Several resources to assist the Lead Agency with identifying potential mitigation measures for the Proposed Project include South Coast AQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook¹, South Coast AQMD's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan¹¹, and Southern California Association of Government's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy¹².

Mitigation measures for operational air quality impacts from mobile sources that the Lead Agency should consider in the Supplemental EIR may include the following:

- Require zero-emissions (ZE) or near-zero emission (NZE) on-road haul trucks such as heavy-duty trucks with natural gas engines that meet the CARB's adopted optional NOx emissions standard at 0.02 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr), if and when feasible. Given the state's clean truck rules and regulations aiming to accelerate the utilization and market penetration of ZE and NZE trucks such as the Advanced Clean Trucks Rule¹³ and the Heavy-Duty Low NOx Omnibus Regulation¹⁴, ZE and NZE trucks will become increasingly more available to use. The Lead Agency should require a phase-in schedule to incentive the use of these cleaner operating trucks to reduce any significant adverse air quality impacts. South Coast AQMD staff is available to discuss the availability of current and upcoming truck technologies and incentive programs with the Lead Agency. At a minimum, require the use of 2010 model year¹⁵ that meet CARB's 2010 engine emissions standards at 0.01 g/bhp-hr of particulate matter (PM) and 0.20 g/bhp-hr of NOx emissions or newer, cleaner trucks. Include environmental analyses to evaluate and identify sufficient electricity and supportive infrastructures in the Energy and Utilities and Service Systems Sections in the CEQA document, where appropriate. Include the requirement in applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts. Operators shall maintain records of all trucks associated with project construction to document that each truck

¹⁰ South Coast AQMD. MATES INV Estimated Risk. Accessed at: <https://scaqmd-online.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=470c30bc6daf4ef6a43f0082973ff45f>.

¹¹ South Coast AQMD's 2016 Air Quality Management Plan can be found at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/Agendas/Governing-Board/2017/2017-mar3-035.pdf> (starting on page 86).

¹² Southern California Association of Governments' 2020-2045 RTP/SCS can be found at: https://www.connectsocial.org/Documents/PEIR/certified/Exhibit-A_ConnectSoCal_PEIR.pdf.

¹³ CARB. June 25, 2020. *Advanced Clean Trucks Rule*. Accessed at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/advanced-clean-trucks>.

¹⁴ CARB has recently passed a variety of new regulations that require new, cleaner heavy-duty truck technology to be sold and used in state. For example, on August 27, 2020, CARB approved the Heavy-Duty Low NOx Omnibus Regulation, which will require all trucks to meet the adopted emission standard of 0.05 g/hp-hr starting with engine model year 2024. Accessed at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/rulemaking/2020/hdomnibuslownox>.

¹⁵ CARB adopted the statewide Truck and Bus Regulation in 2010. The Regulation requires diesel trucks and buses that operate in California to be upgraded to reduce emissions. Newer heavier trucks and buses must meet particulate matter filter requirements beginning January 1, 2012. Lighter and older heavier trucks must be replaced starting January 1, 2015. By January 1, 2023, nearly all trucks and buses will need to have 2010 model year engines or equivalent. More information on the CARB's Truck and Bus Regulation is available at: <https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm>.

used meets these emission standards, and make the records available for inspection. The Lead Agency should conduct regular inspections to the maximum extent feasible to ensure compliance.

- Limit the daily number of trucks allowed at the Proposed Project to levels analyzed in the Final CEQA document. If higher daily truck volumes are anticipated to visit the site, the Lead Agency should commit to re-evaluating the Proposed Project through CEQA prior to allowing this higher activity level.
- Provide electric vehicle (EV) charging stations or at a minimum, provide the electrical infrastructure and electrical panels should be appropriately sized. Electrical hookups should be provided for truckers to plug in any onboard auxiliary equipment.

Mitigation measures for operational air quality impacts from other area sources that the Lead Agency should consider in the Supplemental EIR may include the following:

- Maximize use of solar energy by installing solar energy arrays.
- Use light colored paving and roofing materials.
- Utilize only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices, and appliances.
- Use of water-based or low VOC cleaning products that go beyond the requirements of South Coast AQMD Rule 1113.

Design considerations for the Proposed Project that the Lead Agency should consider to further reduce air quality and health risk impacts include the following:

- Clearly mark truck routes with trailblazer signs, so that trucks will not travel next to or near sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools, day care centers, etc.).
- Design the Proposed Project such that truck entrances and exits are not facing sensitive receptors and trucks will not travel past sensitive land uses to enter or leave the Proposed Project site.
- Design the Proposed Project such that any check-in point for trucks is inside the Proposed Project site to ensure that there are no trucks queuing outside.
- Design the Proposed Project to ensure that truck traffic inside the Proposed Project site is as far away as feasible from sensitive receptors.
- Restrict overnight truck parking in sensitive land uses by providing overnight truck parking inside the Proposed Project site.

Health Risk Reduction Strategies

Many strategies are available to reduce exposures, including, but are not limited to, building filtration systems with MERV 13 or better, or in some cases, MERV 15 or better is recommended; building design, orientation, location; vegetation barriers or landscaping screening, etc. Enhanced filtration units are capable of reducing exposures. However, enhanced filtration systems have limitations. For example, in a study that South Coast AQMD conducted to investigate filters¹⁶, a cost burden is expected to be within the range of \$120 to \$240 per year to replace each filter panel. The initial start-up cost could substantially increase if an HVAC system needs to be installed and if standalone filter units are required. Installation costs may vary and include costs for conducting site assessments and obtaining permits and approvals before filters can be installed. Other costs may include filter life monitoring, annual maintenance, and training for conducting maintenance and reporting. In addition, because the filters would not have any effectiveness unless the HVAC system is running, there may be increased energy consumption that the Lead Agency should evaluate in the Supplemental EIR. It is typically assumed that the filters operate 100 percent of the time while residents are indoors, and the environmental analysis does not generally account

¹⁶ This study evaluated filters rated MERV 13 or better. Accessed at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/aqmdpilotstudyfinalreport.pdf>. Also see 2012 Peer Review Journal article by South Coast AQMD: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ina.12013>.

for the times when the residents have their windows or doors open or are in common space areas of the project. These filters have no ability to filter out any toxic gases. Furthermore, when used filters are replaced, replacement has the potential to result in emissions from the transportation of used filters at disposal sites and generate solid waste that the Lead Agency should evaluate in the Supplemental EIR. Therefore, the presumed effectiveness and feasibility of any filtration units should be carefully evaluated in more detail prior to assuming that they will sufficiently alleviate exposures to diesel particulate matter emissions.

South Coast AQMD staff is available to work with the Lead Agency to ensure that air quality, greenhouse gas, and health risk impacts from the Proposed Project are accurately evaluated and mitigated where feasible. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at lsun@aqmd.gov.

Sincerely,

Lijin Sun

Lijin Sun, J.D.

Program Supervisor, CEQA IGR

Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources

LS

LAC210420-07

Control Number



State of California – Natural Resources Agency

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 467-4201

www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



May 12, 2021

Gena Guisar
City of Carson
Community Development Department
701 East Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745
gguisar@carson.ca.gov

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment, SCH #2005051059, City of Carson, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Guisar:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) from the City of Carson (City; Lead Agency) for the District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment (Project). Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may be required to carry out or approve through the exercise of its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

CDFW's Role

CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State [Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subdivision (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, § 15386, subdivision (a)]. CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (Id., § 1802). Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect State fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW is also submitting comments as a Responsible Agency under CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381). CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code, including lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 *et seq.*). Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take", as defined by State law, of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 *et seq.*), or CESA-listed rare plant pursuant to the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA;

Conserving California's Wildlife Since 1870

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 2 of 12

Fish & G. Code, §1900 *et seq.*), CDFW recommends the Project proponent obtain appropriate authorization under the Fish and Game Code.

Project Description and Summary

Objective: The City is proposing to prepare a 2021 SEIR to evaluate changes to the District at South Bay Specific Plan. The Project would retain the same land uses adopted by the City under the 2018 Specific Plan for Planning Areas 1 and 2. The revisions to the 2021 Project would occur entirely within Planning Area 3 of the Specific Plan, which is proposed to introduce new light industrial uses along with up to approximately 6.29 acres of passive and active publicly accessible open space areas.

The Project site is currently mostly vacant and lacking vegetation, with a history of use as a landfill, for water treatment, and water retention. Project-related activities include grading, road construction, commercial and industrial building construction, and installation of public utility infrastructure.

Location: The Project site is located on a 157-acre site at 20400 E. Main Street in the City of Carson. The site is in the South Bay areas of Los Angeles County, west of the San Diego Freeway (I-405), south of Del Amo Boulevard, and north of the Avalon Boulevard interchange with I-405. The boundaries of the Project are the same as in the 2018 Specific Plan.

Comments and Recommendations

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the City in adequately identifying, avoiding, and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct, and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. CDFW looks forward to commenting on the SEIR when it is released. CDFW may have additional comments to the SEIR not addressed in this letter.

Specific Comments

- 1) Jurisdictional Waters. The western and southern boundaries of the Project site are bordered by the Torrance Lateral Drainage Canal, which drains immediately into the Dominguez Channel. Proposed Project designs appear to utilize the entirety of the site up to the edge of the canal and significantly increase impervious surfaces. Due to the proximity of Project-related activities and the potential need for on-site stormwater management requiring outfalls into the adjacent canal, the Project may impact riparian resources located adjacent to and downstream of the Project site.

As a Responsible Agency under CEQA, CDFW has authority over activities in streams and/or lakes that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (including vegetation associated with the stream or lake) of a river or stream or use material from a streambed. For any such activities, the project applicant (or "entity") must provide written notification to CDFW pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 1600 *et seq.*

- a) CDFW's issuance of a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement for a project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by CDFW as a Responsible Agency. As a Responsible Agency, CDFW may consider the environmental

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 3 of 12

document of the local jurisdiction (Lead Agency) for the Project. To minimize additional requirements by CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* and/or under CEQA, the environmental document should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring, and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA Agreement. Please visit CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration Program webpage for information about LSA Notification (CDFWa 2020).

- b) In the event the Project area may support aquatic, riparian, and wetland habitats; a preliminary delineation of the streams and their associated riparian habitats should be included in the environmental document. The delineation should be conducted pursuant to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) wetland definition adopted by CDFW (Cowardin et al. 1979). Be advised that some wetland and riparian habitats subject to CDFW's authority may extend beyond the jurisdictional limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Section 404 permit and Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 Certification.
 - c) In Project areas which may support ephemeral or episodic streams, herbaceous vegetation, woody vegetation, and woodlands also serve to protect the integrity of these resources and help maintain natural sedimentation processes. Therefore, CDFW recommends effective setbacks be established to maintain appropriately sized vegetated buffer areas adjoining ephemeral drainages. The environmental document should provide a justification for the effectiveness of the chosen distance for the setback.
 - d) Project-related changes in upstream and downstream drainage patterns, runoff, and sedimentation should be included and evaluated in the environmental document.
 - e) As part of the LSA Notification process, CDFW requests a hydrological evaluation of the 100, 50, 25, 10, 5, and 2-year frequency storm event for existing and proposed conditions. CDFW recommends the environmental document evaluate the results and address avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures that may be necessary to reduce potential significant impacts.
- 2) Burrowing Owl. Burrowing owl (*Athene cuniculara*), a California Species of Special Concern (SSC), have been observed as recently as 2019 about one mile north of the Project site on the California State University, Dominguez Hills campus (eBird 2021). The NOP describes the site as having "crushed concrete piles, detention and retention ponds, a groundwater treatment plan, and a gas plant extraction facility." Burrowing owls are known to inhabit vacant lots and use artificial sources for burrows, such as debris piles or exposed pipes.
- a) CDFW recommends the City perform a protocol-level survey for burrowing owls adhering to survey methods described in CDFW's March 7, 2012, [Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation](#) (CDFW 2012). All survey efforts should be conducted by a qualified biologist. Survey protocol for breeding season owl surveys states to conduct four survey visits: 1) at least one site visit between February 15 and April 15, and 2) a minimum of three survey visits, at least three weeks apart, between April 15 and July 15, with at least one visit after June 15. Full disclosure of the presence/absence of burrowing owls is necessary to help the City's determination of whether the Project

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 4 of 12

would impact burrowing owls, thus requiring mitigation. The Project and environmental document should be conditioned to avoid and/or mitigate for potential impacts to burrowing owl and habitat.

- 3) Nesting Birds. Multiple on-site trees and shrubs will be removed as part of the proposed Project. This vegetation may provide potential nesting habitat where Project activities may impact nesting birds. Project activities occurring during the breeding season of nesting birds could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs, or nestlings, or otherwise lead to nest abandonment in trees directly adjacent to the Project boundary. The Project could also lead to the loss of foraging habitat for sensitive bird species.
 - a) Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 50, § 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA). It is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any raptor.
 - b) CDFW recommends that measures be taken to fully avoid Project impacts to nesting birds and raptors. Proposed Project-related ground-disturbing activities (e.g., mobilizing, staging, drilling, and excavating) and vegetation removal should occur outside of the avian breeding season which generally runs from February 15 through August 31 (as early as January 1 for some raptors) to avoid take of birds, raptors, or their eggs.
 - c) If impacts to nesting birds and raptors cannot be avoided, CDFW recommends the SEIR include measures to mitigate for impacts. CDFW recommends surveys by a qualified biologist with experience conducting breeding bird and raptor surveys. Surveys are needed to detect protected native birds and raptors occurring in suitable nesting habitat that may be disturbed and any other such habitat within 300 feet of the Project disturbance area, to the extent allowable and accessible. For raptors, this radius should be expanded to 500 feet and 0.5 mile for special status species. Project personnel, including all contractors working on site, should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. Reductions in the nest buffer distance may be appropriate depending on the avian species involved, ambient levels of human activity, screening vegetation, or possibly other factors.
 - d) CDFW recommends the SEIR provide an analysis of the expected increase in human presence and any subsequent change in traffic, noise level and frequency, and artificial lighting relative to a no build alternative. Using these expected elevated levels of human-driven disturbances, further consideration should be given to potential impacts to birds and raptors nesting within and adjacent to the Project site.
- 4) Non-Native Plants and Landscaping. The proposed Project will involve significant landscaping throughout the Project site for aesthetic purposes. Invasive plant species spread quickly and can displace native plants, prevent native plant growth, and create monocultures. CDFW recommends using native, locally appropriate plant species for landscaping on the Project site, similar to species found in adjacent natural habitats.

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 5 of 12

- a) If the Project may involve landscaping, CDFW recommends the SEIR provide the landscaping plant palette and restrict use of species listed as 'Moderate' or 'High' by the [California Invasive Plant Council](#) (Cal-IPC 2021). These species are documented to have substantial and severe ecological impacts on physical processes, plant and animal communities, and vegetation structure.
- b) If non-native invasive plants are on site, CDFW recommends the SEIR provide measures to reduce the spread of non-natives during Project construction and activities. Spreading non-native plants during Project activities may have the potential to impact areas not currently exposed to non-native plants. This could result in expediting the loss of natural habitats in and adjacent to the Project site and should be prevented.

General Comments

- 1) Disclosure. A SEIR should provide an adequate, complete, and detailed disclosure about the effect which a proposed project is likely to have on the environment (Pub. Resources Code, § 20161; CEQA Guidelines, §15151). Adequate disclosure is necessary so CDFW may provide comments on the adequacy of proposed avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures, as well as to assess the significance of the specific impact relative to the species (e.g., current range, distribution, population trends, and connectivity).
- 2) Mitigation Measures. Public agencies have a duty under CEQA to prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures [CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15002(a)(3), 15021]. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4, an environmental impact report should describe feasible measures which could mitigate for impacts below a significant level under CEQA.
 - a) Level of Detail. Mitigation measures must be feasible, effective, implemented, and fully enforceable/imposed by the lead agency through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6(b); CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, 15041). A public agency should provide the measures that are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6). CDFW recommends that the City prepare mitigation measures that are specific, detailed (i.e., responsible party, timing, specific actions, location), and clear in order for a measure to be fully enforceable and implemented successfully via a mitigation monitoring and/or reporting program (CEQA Guidelines, § 15097; Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6). Adequate disclosure is necessary so CDFW may provide comments on the adequacy and feasibility of proposed mitigation measures.
 - b) Disclosure of Impacts. If a proposed mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects, in addition to impacts caused by the Project as proposed, the environmental document should include a discussion of the effects of proposed mitigation measures [CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4(a)(1)]. In that regard, the environmental document should provide an adequate, complete, and detailed disclosure about a project's proposed mitigation measure(s). Adequate disclosure is necessary so CDFW may assess the potential impacts of proposed mitigation measures.

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 6 of 12

- 3) Biological Baseline Assessment. In preparation of the SEIR, CDFW recommends providing a complete assessment and impact analysis of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the Project site and where the Project may result in ground disturbance. The assessment and analysis should place emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, sensitive, regionally, and locally unique species, and sensitive habitats. Impact analysis will aid in determining any direct, indirect, and cumulative biological impacts, as well as specific mitigation or avoidance measures necessary to offset those impacts. CDFW recommends avoiding any sensitive natural communities found on or adjacent to the Project. CDFW also considers impacts to SSC a significant direct and cumulative adverse effect without implementing appropriate avoid and/or mitigation measures. The SEIR should include the following information:
- a) Information on the regional setting that is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region [CEQA Guidelines, § 15125(c)]. The SEIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect Sensitive Natural Communities from Project-related impacts. Project implementation may result in impacts to rare or endangered plants or plant communities that have been recorded adjacent to the Project vicinity. CDFW considers these communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance. Plant communities, alliances, and associations with a State-wide ranking of S1, S2, S3 and S4 should be considered sensitive and declining at the local and regional level. These ranks can be obtained by visiting [Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program - Natural Communities](#) webpage (CDFW 2021a).
 - b) A thorough, recent, floristic-based assessment of special status plants and natural communities following CDFW's [Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities](#) (CDFW 2018). Adjoining habitat areas should be included where Project construction and activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts off site.
 - c) Floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and vegetation impact assessments conducted at the Project site and within the neighboring vicinity. The [Manual of California Vegetation](#) (MCV), second edition, should also be used to inform this mapping and assessment (Sawyer et al. 2009). Adjoining habitat areas should be included in this assessment where site activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts off-site. Habitat mapping at the alliance level will help establish baseline vegetation conditions.
 - d) A complete, recent, assessment of the biological resources associated with each habitat type on site and within adjacent areas that could also be affected by the Project. CDFW's [California Natural Diversity Database](#) (CNDDDB) in Sacramento should be contacted to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat (CDFW 2021b). The SEIR should include a nine-quadrangle search of the CNDDDB to determine a list of species potentially present at the Project site. A lack of records in the CNDDDB does not mean that rare, threatened, or endangered plants and wildlife do not occur in the Project site. Field verification for the presence or absence of sensitive species is necessary to provide a complete biological assessment for adequate CEQA review [CEQA Guidelines, § 15003(i)].

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 7 of 12

- e) A complete, recent, assessment of rare, threatened, and endangered, and other sensitive species on site and within the area of potential effect, including SSC, and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code, §§ 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition of endangered, rare, or threatened species (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380). Seasonal variations in use of the Project site should also be addressed such as wintering, roosting, nesting, and foraging habitat. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, may be required if suitable habitat is present. See CDFW's [Survey and Monitoring Protocols and Guidelines](#) for established survey protocol for select species (CDFW 2018). Acceptable species-specific survey procedures may be developed in consultation with CDFW and the USFWS.
 - f) A recent wildlife and rare plant survey. CDFW generally considers biological field assessments for wildlife to be valid for a one-year period, and assessments for rare plants may be considered valid for a period of up to three years. Some aspects of the proposed Project may warrant periodic updated surveys for certain sensitive taxa, particularly if build out could occur over a protracted time frame or in phases.
- 4) Data. CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations [Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e)]. Accordingly, please report any special status species and natural communities detected by completing and submitting [CNDDDB Field Survey Forms](#) (CDFW 2021c). The City should ensure the data has been properly submitted, with all data fields applicable filled out. The data entry should also list pending development as a threat and then update this occurrence after impacts have occurred.
- 5) Biological Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts. CDFW recommends providing a thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts. The SEIR should address the following:
- a) A discussion regarding indirect Project impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands [e.g., preserve lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP, Fish & G. Code, § 2800 et. seq.)]. Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in adjacent areas, should be fully evaluated in the SEIR.
 - b) A discussion of both the short-term and long-term effects to species population distribution and concentration and alterations of the ecosystem supporting the species impacted [CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.2(a)].
 - c) A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, temporary and permanent human activity, and exotic species and identification of any mitigation measures.
 - d) A discussion on Project-related changes on drainage patterns; the volume, velocity, and

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 8 of 12

frequency of existing and post-Project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and, post-Project fate of runoff from the Project sites. The discussion should also address the proximity of the extraction activities to the water table, whether dewatering would be necessary and the potential resulting impacts on the habitat (if any) supported by the groundwater. Mitigation measures proposed to alleviate such Project impacts should be included.

- e) An analysis of impacts from proposed changes to land use designations and zoning, and existing land use designation and zoning located nearby or adjacent to natural areas that may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions. A discussion of possible conflicts and mitigation measures to reduce these conflicts should be included in the SEIR.
 - f) A cumulative effects analysis, as described under CEQA Guidelines section 15130. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant and wildlife species, habitat, and vegetation communities. If the City determines that the Project would not have a cumulative impact, the environmental document should indicate why the cumulative impact is not significant. The City's conclusion should be supported by facts and analyses [CEQA Guidelines, § 15130(a)(2)].
- 6) Project Description and Alternatives. To enable CDFW to adequately review and comment on the proposed Project from the standpoint of the protection of plants, fish, and wildlife, we recommend the following information be included in the SEIR:
- a) A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed Project, including all staging areas and access routes to the construction and staging areas.
 - b) CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a) states that an environmental document should describe a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(f)(2) states if the Lead Agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion and should include reasons in the environmental document.
 - c) A range of feasible alternatives to Project component location and design features to avoid or otherwise minimize direct and indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources and wildlife movement areas. CDFW recommends the City consider configuring Project construction and activities, as well as the development footprint, in such a way as to fully avoid impacts to sensitive and special status plants and wildlife species, habitat, and sensitive vegetation communities. CDFW also recommends the City consider establishing appropriate setbacks from sensitive and special status biological resources. Setbacks should not be impacted by ground disturbance or hydrological changes for the duration of the Project and from any future development. As a general rule, CDFW recommends reducing or clustering the development footprint to retain unobstructed spaces for vegetation and wildlife and provide connections for wildlife between properties and minimize obstacles to open space.

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 9 of 12

Project alternatives should be thoroughly evaluated, even if an alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the Project objectives or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6).

- d) Where the Project may impact aquatic and riparian resources, CDFW recommends the City consider alternatives that would fully avoid impacts to such resources. CDFW also recommends alternatives that would allow not impede, alter, or otherwise modify existing surface flow; watercourse and meander; and water-dependent ecosystems and vegetation communities. Project-related designs should consider elevated crossings to avoid channelizing or narrowing of streams. Any modifications to a river, creek, or stream may cause or magnify upstream bank erosion, channel incision, and drop in water level and cause the stream to alter its course of flow.
- 7) Translocation/Salvage of Plants and Animal Species. Translocation and transplantation is the process of moving an individual from a project site and permanently moving it to a new location. CDFW generally does not support the use of, translocation or transplantation as the primary mitigation strategy for unavoidable impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species. Studies have shown that these efforts are experimental and the outcome unreliable. CDFW has found that permanent preservation and management of habitat capable of supporting these species is often a more effective long-term strategy for conserving sensitive plants and animals and their habitats.
- 8) Moving out of Harm's Way. To avoid direct mortality, we recommend that a qualified biological monitor, approved by CDFW, be on-site prior to and during ground and habitat disturbing activities. The biological monitor may need to move any special status species or other wildlife of low mobility out of harm's way that would likely be injured or killed by Project-related construction activities, such as grubbing or grading. It should be noted that the temporary relocation of on-site wildlife does not constitute effective mitigation for the purposes of offsetting Project impacts associated with habitat loss. If the Project requires species to be removed, disturbed, or otherwise handled, we recommend that the SEIR clearly identify that the designated entity should obtain all appropriate State and federal permits.

CDFW has the authority to issue permits for the take or possession of wildlife, including mammals; birds, nests, and eggs; reptiles, amphibians, fish, plants; and invertebrates (Fish & G. Code, §§ 1002, 1002.5, 1003). Effective October 1, 2018, a Scientific Collecting Permit is required to monitor project impacts on wildlife resources, as required by environmental documents, permits, or other legal authorizations; and, to capture, temporarily possess, and relocate wildlife to avoid harm or mortality in connection with otherwise lawful activities (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 650). Please visit CDFW's [Scientific Collecting Permits webpage](#) for information (CDFW 2021d).

- 9) Wetland Resources. CDFW, as described in Fish and Game Code section 703(a), is guided by the Fish and Game Commission's (Commission) policies. The [Wetlands Resources](#) policy the Commission "...seek[s] to provide for the protection, preservation, restoration, enhancement and expansion of wetland habitat in California (CFGC 2021). Further, it is the policy of the Fish and Game Commission to strongly discourage development in or conversion of wetlands. It opposes, consistent with its legal authority, any development or conversion that would result in a reduction of wetland acreage or wetland habitat values. To

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 10 of 12

that end, the Commission opposes wetland development proposals unless, at a minimum, project mitigation assures there will be 'no net loss' of either wetland habitat values or acreage. The Commission strongly prefers mitigation which would achieve expansion of wetland acreage and enhancement of wetland habitat values."

- a) The Wetlands Resources policy provides a framework for maintaining wetland resources and establishes mitigation guidance. CDFW encourages avoidance of wetland resources as a primary mitigation measure and discourages the development or type conversion of wetlands to uplands. CDFW encourages activities that would avoid the reduction of wetland acreage, function, or habitat values. Once avoidance and minimization measures have been exhausted, the Project must include mitigation measures to assure a "no net loss" of either wetland habitat values, or acreage, for unavoidable impacts to wetland resources. Conversions include, but are not limited to, conversion to subsurface drains, placement of fill or building of structures within the wetland, and channelization or removal of materials from the streambed. All wetlands and watercourses, whether ephemeral, intermittent, or perennial, should be retained and provided with substantial setbacks, which preserve the riparian and aquatic values and functions for the benefit to on-site and off-site wildlife populations. CDFW recommends mitigation measures to compensate for unavoidable impacts be included in the SEIR and these measures should compensate for the loss of function and value.
 - b) The Fish and Game Commission's [Water policy](#) guides CDFW on the quantity and quality of the waters of this State that should be apportioned and maintained respectively so as to produce and sustain maximum numbers of fish and wildlife; to provide maximum protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife and their habitat; encourage and support programs to maintain or restore a high quality of the waters of this State; prevent the degradation thereof caused by pollution and contamination; and, endeavor to keep as much water as possible open and accessible to the public for the use and enjoyment of fish and wildlife. CDFW recommends avoidance of water practices and structures that use excessive amounts of water, and minimization of impacts that negatively affect water quality, to the extent feasible (Fish & G. Code, § 5650).
- 10) CESA. CDFW considers adverse impacts to a species protected by CESA to be significant without mitigation under CEQA. As to CESA, take of any endangered, threatened, candidate species, or CESA-listed plant species that results from the Project is prohibited, except as authorized by state law (Fish & G. Code §§ 2080, 2085; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §786.9). Consequently, if the Project or any Project-related activity during the life of the Project will result in take of a species designated as endangered or threatened, or a candidate for listing under CESA, CDFW recommends that the Project proponent seek appropriate take authorization under CESA prior to implementing the Project. Appropriate authorization from CDFW may include an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) or a consistency determination in certain circumstances, among other options [Fish & Game Code, §§ 2080.1, 2081, subds. (b) and (c)]. Early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to a Project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA Permit. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1998, may require that CDFW issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of an ITP unless the Project CEQA document addresses all Project impacts to CESA-listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of an ITP. For these reasons, biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 11 of 12

requirements for a CESA ITP

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment to assist the City of Carson in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Andrew Valand, Environmental Scientist, at Andrew.Valand@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

Erinn Wilson-Olgin

B6E58CFE24724F5...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Environmental Program Manager I
South Coast Region

ec: CDFW

Victoria Tang, Los Alamitos – Victoria.Tang@wildlife.ca.gov
Ruby Kwan-Davis, Los Alamitos – Ruby.Kwan-Davis@wildlife.ca.gov
Felicia Silva, Los Alamitos – Felicia.Silva@wildlife.ca.gov
Frederic Rieman, Los Alamitos – Frederic.Rieman@wildlife.ca.gov
Susan Howell, San Diego – Susan.Howell@wildlife.ca.gov
CEQA Program Coordinator, Sacramento – CEQACommentLetters@wildlife.ca.gov

State Clearinghouse - State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

Gena Guisar
City of Carson, Community Development Department
May 12, 2021
Page 12 of 12

References:

[Cal-IPC] California Invasive Plant Council. 2021. The Cal-IPC Inventory. Available from:
<https://www.cal-ipc.org/plants/inventory/>

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018. Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities. Available from: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959&inline>.

[CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2012. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. Available from: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83843>.

[CDFWa] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. Natural Communities. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities>.

[CDFWb] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. California Natural Diversity Database. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB>

[CDFWc] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. Submitting Data to the CNDDDB. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>

[CDFWd] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. Scientific Collecting Permit. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Licensing/Scientific-Collecting>.

[CFGc] California Fish and Game Commission. 2021. Policies. Miscellaneous: Water. Available from: <https://fgc.ca.gov/About/Policies/Miscellaneous#Water>.

[CFGc] California Fish and Game Commission. 2021. Policies. Retention of Wetland Acreage and Habitat Values. Available from: <https://fgc.ca.gov/About/Policies/Miscellaneous>.

Cowardin, Lewis M., Carter, V., Golet, Francis C., and LaRoe, Edward T. 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service.

eBird. 2021. CSU Dominguez Hills. Los Angeles County, California, US. Available from: <https://ebird.org/hotspot/L686348>.

Sawyer, J. O., Keeler-Wolf, T., and Evens J.M. 2009. A manual of California Vegetation, 2nd ed. ISBN 978-0-943460-49-9.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 7
100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE (213) 269-1124
FAX (213) 897-1337
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



*Making Conservation
a California Way of Life*

May 12, 2021

Ms. Gena Guisar, Contract Planner
Community Development Department
City of Carson
701 East Carson Street

RE: The District at South Bay Specific Plan
Amendment
Vic. LA-405 PM 11.23, LA-110/PM 8.05
SCH # 2005051059
GTS # LA-2017-03557AL-NOP

Dear Ms. Guisar:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The City, as lead agency, is proposing to prepare a 2021 SEIR to evaluate the changes proposed by the 2021 Project to The District at South Bay Specific Plan.

The 2021 Specific Plan Amendment would consist of approximately 2,312,390 square feet of light industrial, regional commercial, neighborhood-serving commercial/retail, restaurant/cafe, restaurants with a drive-thru component, and food and beverage kiosks. Overall, with these proposed modifications, the square footage proposed for development under the 2021 Specific Plan Amendment would increase the square footage of development on the 157 Acre Site under the approved 2018 Specific Plan, from 1,834,833 square feet to 2,312,390 square feet. The residential units would remain at 1,250 units.

The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe and reliable transportation network that serves all people and respects the environment. Senate Bill 743 (2013) has been codified into CEQA law. It mandates that CEQA review of transportation impacts of proposed developments be modified by using Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the primary metric in identifying transportation impacts. As a reminder, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is the standard transportation analysis metric in CEQA for land use projects after the July 1, 2020 statewide implementation date. You may reference The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) website for more information.

<http://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/updates/guidelines/>

This development should incorporate multi-modal and complete streets transportation elements that will actively promote alternatives to car use and better manage existing parking assets. Prioritizing and allocating space to efficient modes of travel such as bicycling and public transit can allow streets to transport more people in a fixed amount of right-of-way.

Caltrans supports the implementation of complete streets and pedestrian safety measures such as road diets and other traffic calming measures. Please note the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) recognizes the road diet treatment as a proven safety countermeasure, and the cost of a road diet can be significantly reduced if implemented in tandem with routine street resurfacing.

Also, Caltrans has published the VMT-focused Transportation Impact Study Guide (TISG), dated, May 20, 2020 and Caltrans Interim Land Development and Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Safety Review Practitioners Guidance, prepared on December 18, 2020.

<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/transportation-planning/office-of-smart-mobility-climate-change/sb-743>

Overall, the environmental report should include a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) to ensure all modes are well served by planning and development activities. This includes reducing single occupancy vehicle trips, ensuring safety, reducing vehicle miles traveled, supporting accessibility, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

We encourage the Lead Agency to evaluate the potential of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) applications in order to better manage the transportation network, as well as transit service and bicycle or pedestrian connectivity improvements.

For additional TDM options, please refer to the Federal Highway Administration's Integrating Demand Management into the Transportation Planning Process: A Desk Reference (Chapter 8). This reference is available online at:

<http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop12035/fhwahop12035.pdf>

Ms. Gena Guisar, Contract Planner

May 12, 2021

Page 3 of 3

Caltrans encourages lead agencies to complete traffic safety impact analysis in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process so that, through partnerships and collaboration, California can reach zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2050.

For your consideration, we recommend all mitigation measures on the State facilities from the 2018 SEIR remained in the new 2021 DEIR, especially the Mitigation Measure C-8 Figueroa Street and I-110 Northbound Ramps (Intersection No. 12).

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 269-1124 and refer to GTS # LA-2017-03557AL-NOP.

Sincerely,

Frances Duong for

MIYA EDMONSON
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief

email: State Clearinghouse

P: (626) 381-9248
F: (626) 389-5414
E: info@mitchtsailaw.com



Mitchell M. Tsai
Attorney At Law

155 South El Molino Avenue
Suite 104
Pasadena, California 91101

VIA E-MAIL

May 17, 2021

Gena Guisar
City of Carson
Community Development Department
701 East Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745
Em: gguisar@carson.ca.gov

RE: The District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment

Dear Ms. Guisar,

On behalf of the Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters (“**Carpenters**” or “**SWRCC**”), my Office is submitting these comments on the City of Carson’s (“**City**” or “**Lead Agency**”) Notice of Preparation of an supplemental Environmental Impact Report (“**NOI**”) (SCH No. 2005051059) for the District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment (“**Project**”).

The Southwest Carpenters is a labor union representing 50,000 union carpenters in six states, including California, and has a strong interest in well-ordered land use planning, addressing the environmental impacts of development projects and equitable economic development.

Individual members of the Southwest live, work and recreate in the City and surrounding communities and would be directly affected by the Project’s environmental impacts.

Commenter expressly reserves the right to supplement these comments at or prior to hearings on the Project, and at any later hearings and proceedings related to this Project. Cal. Gov. Code § 65009(b); Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21177(a); *Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. Bakersfield* (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1199-1203; see *Galante Vineyards v. Monterey Water Dist.* (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 1121.

Commenter incorporates by reference all comments raising issues regarding the supplemental environmental impact report (“**EIR**”) submitted prior to certification of the EIR for the Project. *Citizens for Clean Energy v City of Woodland* (2014) 225 Cal. App. 4th 173, 191 (finding that any party who has objected to the Project’s environmental documentation may assert any issue timely raised by other parties).

Moreover, Commenter requests that the Lead Agency provide notice for any and all notices referring or related to the Project issued under the California Environmental Quality Act (“**CEQA**”), Cal Public Resources Code (“**PRC**”) § 21000 *et seq*, and the California Planning and Zoning Law (“**Planning and Zoning Law**”), Cal. Gov’t Code §§ 65000–65010. California Public Resources Code Sections 21092.2, and 21167(f) and Government Code Section 65092 require agencies to mail such notices to any person who has filed a written request for them with the clerk of the agency’s governing body.

The City should require the all developers of the Project Site to provide additional community benefits such as requiring local hire and use of a skilled and trained workforce to build the Project. The City should require the use of workers who have graduated from a Joint Labor Management apprenticeship training program approved by the State of California, or have at least as many hours of on-the-job experience in the applicable craft which would be required to graduate from such a state approved apprenticeship training program or who are registered apprentices in an apprenticeship training program approved by the State of California.

Community benefits such as local hire and skilled and trained workforce requirements can also be helpful to reduce environmental impacts and improve the positive economic impact of the Project. Local hire provisions requiring that a certain percentage of workers reside within 10 miles or less of the Project Site can reduce the length of vendor trips, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and providing localized economic benefits. As environmental consultants Matt Hagemann and Paul E. Rosenfeld note:

[A]ny local hire requirement that results in a decreased worker trip length from the default value has the potential to result in a reduction of construction-related GHG emissions, though the significance of the reduction would vary based on the location and urbanization level of the project site.

March 8, 2021 SWAPE Letter to Mitchell M. Tsai re Local Hire Requirements and Considerations for Greenhouse Gas Modeling.

Skilled and trained workforce requirements promote the development of skilled trades that yield sustainable economic development. As the California Workforce Development Board and the UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education concluded:

. . . labor should be considered an investment rather than a cost – and investments in growing, diversifying, and upskilling California’s workforce can positively affect returns on climate mitigation efforts. In other words, well trained workers are key to delivering emissions reductions and moving California closer to its climate targets.¹

Also, the City should require the Project Site to be developed pursuant to standards exceeding the current 2019 California Green Building Code and 2020 County of Los Angeles Green Building Standards Code to mitigate the Project’s environmental impacts and to advance progress towards the State of California’s environmental goals.

I. **THE PROJECT WOULD BE APPROVED IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT**

A. Background Concerning the California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA has two basic purposes. First, CEQA is designed to inform decision makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of a project. 14 California Code of Regulations (“**CCR**” or “**CEQA Guidelines**”) § 15002(a)(1).² “Its purpose is to inform the public and its responsible officials of the environmental consequences of their decisions *before* they are made. Thus, the EIR ‘protects not only the environment but also informed self-government.’ [Citation.]” *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553, 564. The EIR has been described as

¹ California Workforce Development Board (2020) Putting California on the High Road: A Jobs and Climate Action Plan for 2030 at p. ii, *available at* <https://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Putting-California-on-the-High-Road.pdf>

² The CEQA Guidelines, codified in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, section 150000 et seq, are regulatory guidelines promulgated by the state Natural Resources Agency for the implementation of CEQA. (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21083.) The CEQA Guidelines are given “great weight in interpreting CEQA except when . . . clearly unauthorized or erroneous.” *Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal. 4th 204, 217.

“an environmental ‘alarm bell’ whose purpose it is to alert the public and its responsible officials to environmental changes before they have reached ecological points of no return.” *Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay v. Bd. of Port Comm’rs.* (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344, 1354 (“*Berkeley Jets*”); *County of Inyo v. Yorty* (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 795, 810.

Second, CEQA directs public agencies to avoid or reduce environmental damage when possible by requiring alternatives or mitigation measures. CEQA Guidelines § 15002(a)(2) and (3). *See also, Berkeley Jets*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344, 1354; *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553; *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass’n v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 376, 400. The EIR serves to provide public agencies and the public in general with information about the effect that a proposed project is likely to have on the environment and to “identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced.” CEQA Guidelines § 15002(a)(2). If the project has a significant effect on the environment, the agency may approve the project only upon finding that it has “eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment where feasible” and that any unavoidable significant effects on the environment are “acceptable due to overriding concerns” specified in CEQA section 21081. CEQA Guidelines § 15092(b)(2)(A–B).

While the courts review an EIR using an “abuse of discretion” standard, “the reviewing court is not to ‘uncritically rely on every study or analysis presented by a project proponent in support of its position.’ A ‘clearly inadequate or unsupported study is entitled to no judicial deference.’” *Berkeley Jets*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344, 1355 (emphasis added) (quoting *Laurel Heights*, 47 Cal. 3d at 391, 409 fn. 12). Drawing this line and determining whether the EIR complies with CEQA’s information disclosure requirements presents a question of law subject to independent review by the courts. (*Sierra Club v. Cnty. of Fresno* (2018) 6 Cal. 5th 502, 515; *Madera Oversight Coalition, Inc. v. County of Madera* (2011) 199 Cal. App. 4th 48, 102, 131.) As the court stated in *Berkeley Jets*, 91 Cal. App. 4th at 1355:

A prejudicial abuse of discretion occurs “if the failure to include relevant information precludes informed decision-making and informed public participation, thereby thwarting the statutory goals of the EIR process.

The preparation and circulation of an EIR is more than a set of technical hurdles for agencies and developers to overcome. The EIR’s function is to ensure that government officials who decide to build or approve a project do so with a full

understanding of the environmental consequences and, equally important, that the public is assured those consequences have been considered. For the EIR to serve these goals it must present information so that the foreseeable impacts of pursuing the project can be understood and weighed, and the public must be given an adequate opportunity to comment on that presentation before the decision to go forward is made. *Communities for a Better Environment v. Richmond* (2010) 184 Cal. App. 4th 70, 80 (quoting *Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova* (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 412, 449–450).

B. Due to the COVID-19 Crisis, the City Must Adopt a Mandatory Finding of Significance that the Project May Cause a Substantial Adverse Effect on Human Beings and Mitigate COVID-19 Impacts

CEQA requires that an agency make a finding of significance when a Project may cause a significant adverse effect on human beings. PRC § 21083(b)(3); CEQA Guidelines § 15065(a)(4).

Public health risks related to construction work requires a mandatory finding of significance under CEQA. Construction work has been defined as a Lower to High-risk activity for COVID-19 spread by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Recently, several construction sites have been identified as sources of community spread of COVID-19.³

SWRCC recommends that the Lead Agency adopt additional CEQA mitigation measures to mitigate public health risks from the Project's construction activities. SWRCC requests that the Lead Agency require safe on-site construction work practices as well as training and certification for any construction workers on the Project Site.

In particular, based upon SWRCC's experience with safe construction site work practices, SWRCC recommends that the Lead Agency require that while construction activities are being conducted at the Project Site:

³ Santa Clara County Public Health (June 12, 2020) COVID-19 CASES AT CONSTRUCTION SITES HIGHLIGHT NEED FOR CONTINUED VIGILANCE IN SECTORS THAT HAVE REOPENED, available at <https://www.sccgov.org/sites/covid19/Pages/press-release-06-12-2020-cases-at-construction-sites.aspx>.

Construction Site Design:

- The Project Site will be limited to two controlled entry points.
- Entry points will have temperature screening technicians taking temperature readings when the entry point is open.
- The Temperature Screening Site Plan shows details regarding access to the Project Site and Project Site logistics for conducting temperature screening.
- A 48-hour advance notice will be provided to all trades prior to the first day of temperature screening.
- The perimeter fence directly adjacent to the entry points will be clearly marked indicating the appropriate 6-foot social distancing position for when you approach the screening area. Please reference the Apex temperature screening site map for additional details.
- There will be clear signage posted at the project site directing you through temperature screening.
- Provide hand washing stations throughout the construction site.

Testing Procedures:

- The temperature screening being used are non-contact devices.
- Temperature readings will not be recorded.
- Personnel will be screened upon entering the testing center and should only take 1-2 seconds per individual.
- Hard hats, head coverings, sweat, dirt, sunscreen or any other cosmetics must be removed on the forehead before temperature screening.
- Anyone who refuses to submit to a temperature screening or does not answer the health screening questions will be refused access to the Project Site.

- Screening will be performed at both entrances from 5:30 am to 7:30 am.; main gate [ZONE 1] and personnel gate [ZONE 2]
- After 7:30 am only the main gate entrance [ZONE 1] will continue to be used for temperature testing for anybody gaining entry to the project site such as returning personnel, deliveries, and visitors.
- If the digital thermometer displays a temperature reading above 100.0 degrees Fahrenheit, a second reading will be taken to verify an accurate reading.
- If the second reading confirms an elevated temperature, DHS will instruct the individual that he/she will not be allowed to enter the Project Site. DHS will also instruct the individual to promptly notify his/her supervisor and his/her human resources (HR) representative and provide them with a copy of Annex A.

Planning

- Require the development of an Infectious Disease Preparedness and Response Plan that will include basic infection prevention measures (requiring the use of personal protection equipment), policies and procedures for prompt identification and isolation of sick individuals, social distancing (prohibiting gatherings of no more than 10 people including all-hands meetings and all-hands lunches) communication and training and workplace controls that meet standards that may be promulgated by the Center for Disease Control, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Cal/OSHA, California Department of Public Health or applicable local public health agencies.⁴


⁴ See also The Center for Construction Research and Training, North America's Building Trades Unions (April 27 2020) NABTU and CPWR COVID-19 Standards for U.S. Construction Sites, available at https://www.cpwr.com/sites/default/files/NABTU_CPWR_Standards_COVID-19.pdf; Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (2020) Guidelines for Construction Sites During COVID-19 Pandemic, available at https://dpw.lacounty.gov/building-and-safety/docs/pw_guidelines-construction-sites.pdf.

The United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Carpenters International Training Fund has developed COVID-19 Training and Certification to ensure that Carpenter union members and apprentices conduct safe work practices. The Agency should require that all construction workers undergo COVID-19 Training and Certification before being allowed to conduct construction activities at the Project Site.

SWRCC notes that the NOP fails to notify “each responsible agency, the Office of Planning and Research, and those public agencies having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project” and other “appropriate federal agencies” as required by CEQA. PRC § 21080.4(a). In particular, the NOP fails to notify the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which has jurisdiction over potential Waters of the United States located adjacent to the Dominguez Channel Drainage Project, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which has jurisdiction over potential migratory birds nesting at the Project Site.

If the City has any questions or concerns, feel free to contact my Office.

Sincerely,



Mitchell M. Tsai

Attorneys for Southwest Regional
Council of Carpenters

Attached:

March 8, 2021 SWAPE Letter to Mitchell M. Tsai re Local Hire Requirements and Considerations for Greenhouse Gas Modeling (Exhibit A);

Air Quality and GHG Expert Paul Rosenfeld CV (Exhibit B); and

Air Quality and GHG Expert Matt Hagemann CV (Exhibit C).

EXHIBIT A



Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and
Litigation Support for the Environment

2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Matt Hagemann, P.G, C.Hg.
(949) 887-9013
mhagemann@swape.com

Paul E. Rosenfeld, PhD
(310) 795-2335
prosenfeld@swape.com

March 8, 2021

Mitchell M. Tsai
155 South El Molino, Suite 104
Pasadena, CA 91101

Subject: Local Hire Requirements and Considerations for Greenhouse Gas Modeling

Dear Mr. Tsai,

Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (“SWAPE”) is pleased to provide the following draft technical report explaining the significance of worker trips required for construction of land use development projects with respect to the estimation of greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions. The report will also discuss the potential for local hire requirements to reduce the length of worker trips, and consequently, reduced or mitigate the potential GHG impacts.

Worker Trips and Greenhouse Gas Calculations

The California Emissions Estimator Model (“CalEEMod”) is a “statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects.”¹ CalEEMod quantifies construction-related emissions associated with land use projects resulting from off-road construction equipment; on-road mobile equipment associated with workers, vendors, and hauling; fugitive dust associated with grading, demolition, truck loading, and on-road vehicles traveling along paved and unpaved roads; and architectural coating activities; and paving.²

The number, length, and vehicle class of worker trips are utilized by CalEEMod to calculate emissions associated with the on-road vehicle trips required to transport workers to and from the Project site during construction.³

¹ “California Emissions Estimator Model.” CAPCOA, 2017, available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/caleemod/home>.

² “California Emissions Estimator Model.” CAPCOA, 2017, available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/caleemod/home>.

³ “CalEEMod User’s Guide.” CAPCOA, November 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf?sfvrsn=4, p. 34.

Specifically, the number and length of vehicle trips is utilized to estimate the vehicle miles travelled (“VMT”) associated with construction. Then, utilizing vehicle-class specific EMFAC 2014 emission factors, CalEEMod calculates the vehicle exhaust, evaporative, and dust emissions resulting from construction-related VMT, including personal vehicles for worker commuting.⁴

Specifically, in order to calculate VMT, CalEEMod multiplies the average daily trip rate by the average overall trip length (see excerpt below):

$$\text{“VMT}_d = \Sigma(\text{Average Daily Trip Rate}_i * \text{Average Overall Trip Length}_i)_n$$

Where:

n = Number of land uses being modeled.”⁵

Furthermore, to calculate the on-road emissions associated with worker trips, CalEEMod utilizes the following equation (see excerpt below):

$$\text{“Emissions}_{\text{pollutant}} = \text{VMT} * \text{EF}_{\text{running,pollutant}}$$

Where:

$\text{Emissions}_{\text{pollutant}}$ = emissions from vehicle running for each pollutant

VMT = vehicle miles traveled

$\text{EF}_{\text{running,pollutant}}$ = emission factor for running emissions.”⁶

Thus, there is a direct relationship between trip length and VMT, as well as a direct relationship between VMT and vehicle running emissions. In other words, when the trip length is increased, the VMT and vehicle running emissions increase as a result. Thus, vehicle running emissions can be reduced by decreasing the average overall trip length, by way of a local hire requirement or otherwise.

Default Worker Trip Parameters and Potential Local Hire Requirements

As previously discussed, the number, length, and vehicle class of worker trips are utilized by CalEEMod to calculate emissions associated with the on-road vehicle trips required to transport workers to and from the Project site during construction.⁷ In order to understand how local hire requirements and associated worker trip length reductions impact GHG emissions calculations, it is important to consider the CalEEMod default worker trip parameters. CalEEMod provides recommended default values based on site-specific information, such as land use type, meteorological data, total lot acreage, project type and typical equipment associated with project type. If more specific project information is known, the user can change the default values and input project-specific values, but the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) requires that such changes be justified by substantial evidence.⁸ The default number of construction-related worker trips is calculated by multiplying the

⁴ “Appendix A Calculation Details for CalEEMod.” CAPCOA, October 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/02_appendix-a2016-3-2.pdf?sfvrsn=6, p. 14-15.

⁵ “Appendix A Calculation Details for CalEEMod.” CAPCOA, October 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/02_appendix-a2016-3-2.pdf?sfvrsn=6, p. 23.

⁶ “Appendix A Calculation Details for CalEEMod.” CAPCOA, October 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/02_appendix-a2016-3-2.pdf?sfvrsn=6, p. 15.

⁷ “CalEEMod User’s Guide.” CAPCOA, November 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf?sfvrsn=4, p. 34.

⁸ CalEEMod User Guide, available at: <http://www.caleemod.com/>, p. 1, 9.

number of pieces of equipment for all phases by 1.25, with the exception of worker trips required for the building construction and architectural coating phases.⁹ Furthermore, the worker trip vehicle class is a 50/25/25 percent mix of light duty autos, light duty truck class 1 and light duty truck class 2, respectively.”¹⁰ Finally, the default worker trip length is consistent with the length of the operational home-to-work vehicle trips.¹¹ The operational home-to-work vehicle trip lengths are:

“[B]ased on the *location* and *urbanization* selected on the project characteristic screen. These values were *supplied by the air districts or use a default average for the state*. Each district (or county) also assigns trip lengths for urban and rural settings” (emphasis added).¹²

Thus, the default worker trip length is based on the location and urbanization level selected by the User when modeling emissions. The below table shows the CalEEMod default rural and urban worker trip lengths by air basin (see excerpt below and Attachment A).¹³

Worker Trip Length by Air Basin		
Air Basin	Rural (miles)	Urban (miles)
Great Basin Valleys	16.8	10.8
Lake County	16.8	10.8
Lake Tahoe	16.8	10.8
Mojave Desert	16.8	10.8
Mountain Counties	16.8	10.8
North Central Coast	17.1	12.3
North Coast	16.8	10.8
Northeast Plateau	16.8	10.8
Sacramento Valley	16.8	10.8
Salton Sea	14.6	11
San Diego	16.8	10.8
San Francisco Bay Area	10.8	10.8
San Joaquin Valley	16.8	10.8
South Central Coast	16.8	10.8
South Coast	19.8	14.7
Average	16.47	11.17
Minimum	10.80	10.80
Maximum	19.80	14.70
Range	9.00	3.90

⁹ “CalEEMod User’s Guide.” CAPCOA, November 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf?sfvrsn=4, p. 34.

¹⁰ “Appendix A Calculation Details for CalEEMod.” CAPCOA, October 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/02_appendix-a2016-3-2.pdf?sfvrsn=6, p. 15.

¹¹ “Appendix A Calculation Details for CalEEMod.” CAPCOA, October 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/02_appendix-a2016-3-2.pdf?sfvrsn=6, p. 14.

¹² “Appendix A Calculation Details for CalEEMod.” CAPCOA, October 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/02_appendix-a2016-3-2.pdf?sfvrsn=6, p. 21.

¹³ “Appendix D Default Data Tables.” CAPCOA, October 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/05_appendix-d2016-3-2.pdf?sfvrsn=4, p. D-84 – D-86.

As demonstrated above, default rural worker trip lengths for air basins in California vary from 10.8- to 19.8- miles, with an average of 16.47 miles. Furthermore, default urban worker trip lengths vary from 10.8- to 14.7- miles, with an average of 11.17 miles. Thus, while default worker trip lengths vary by location, default urban worker trip lengths tend to be shorter in length. Based on these trends evident in the CalEEMod default worker trip lengths, we can reasonably assume that the efficacy of a local hire requirement is especially dependent upon the urbanization of the project site, as well as the project location.

Practical Application of a Local Hire Requirement and Associated Impact

To provide an example of the potential impact of a local hire provision on construction-related GHG emissions, we estimated the significance of a local hire provision for the Village South Specific Plan (“Project”) located in the City of Claremont (“City”). The Project proposed to construct 1,000 residential units, 100,000-SF of retail space, 45,000-SF of office space, as well as a 50-room hotel, on the 24-acre site. The Project location is classified as Urban and lies within the Los Angeles-South Coast County. As a result, the Project has a default worker trip length of 14.7 miles.¹⁴ In an effort to evaluate the potential for a local hire provision to reduce the Project’s construction-related GHG emissions, we prepared an updated model, reducing all worker trip lengths to 10 miles (see Attachment B). Our analysis estimates that if a local hire provision with a 10-mile radius were to be implemented, the GHG emissions associated with Project construction would decrease by approximately 17% (see table below and Attachment C).

Local Hire Provision Net Change	
Without Local Hire Provision	
Total Construction GHG Emissions (MT CO ₂ e)	3,623
Amortized Construction GHG Emissions (MT CO ₂ e/year)	120.77
With Local Hire Provision	
Total Construction GHG Emissions (MT CO ₂ e)	3,024
Amortized Construction GHG Emissions (MT CO ₂ e/year)	100.80
% Decrease in Construction-related GHG Emissions	17%

As demonstrated above, by implementing a local hire provision requiring 10 mile worker trip lengths, the Project could reduce potential GHG emissions associated with construction worker trips. More broadly, any local hire requirement that results in a decreased worker trip length from the default value has the potential to result in a reduction of construction-related GHG emissions, though the significance of the reduction would vary based on the location and urbanization level of the project site.

This serves as an example of the potential impacts of local hire requirements on estimated project-level GHG emissions, though it does not indicate that local hire requirements would result in reduced construction-related GHG emission for all projects. As previously described, the significance of a local hire requirement depends on the worker trip length enforced and the default worker trip length for the project’s urbanization level and location.

¹⁴ “Appendix D Default Data Tables.” CAPCOA, October 2017, available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/05_appendix-d2016-3-2.pdf?sfvrsn=4, p. D-85.

Disclaimer

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Matt Hagemann". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Paul E. Rosenfeld". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Paul E. Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

EXHIBIT B



Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

Principal Environmental Chemist

Chemical Fate and Transport & Air Dispersion Modeling

Risk Assessment & Remediation Specialist

Education

Ph.D. Soil Chemistry, University of Washington, 1999. Dissertation on volatile organic compound filtration.

M.S. Environmental Science, U.C. Berkeley, 1995. Thesis on organic waste economics.

B.A. Environmental Studies, U.C. Santa Barbara, 1991. Thesis on wastewater treatment.

Professional Experience

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

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

Professional History:

Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE); 2003 to present; Principal and Founding Partner
UCLA School of Public Health; 2007 to 2011; Lecturer (Assistant Researcher)
UCLA School of Public Health; 2003 to 2006; Adjunct Professor
UCLA Environmental Science and Engineering Program; 2002-2004; Doctoral Intern Coordinator
UCLA Institute of the Environment, 2001-2002; Research Associate
Komex H₂O Science, 2001 to 2003; Senior Remediation Scientist
National Groundwater Association, 2002-2004; Lecturer
San Diego State University, 1999-2001; Adjunct Professor
Anteon Corp., San Diego, 2000-2001; Remediation Project Manager
Ogden (now Amec), San Diego, 2000-2000; Remediation Project Manager
Bechtel, San Diego, California, 1999 – 2000; Risk Assessor
King County, Seattle, 1996 – 1999; Scientist
James River Corp., Washington, 1995-96; Scientist
Big Creek Lumber, Davenport, California, 1995; Scientist
Plumas Corp., California and USFS, Tahoe 1993-1995; Scientist
Peace Corps and World Wildlife Fund, St. Kitts, West Indies, 1991-1993; Scientist

Publications:

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

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

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

Rosenfeld, P.E. & Feng, L. (2011). *The Risks of Hazardous Waste*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2011). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Agrochemical Industry*, Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2008). Methods For Collect Samples For Assessing Dioxins And Other Environmental Contaminants In Attic Dust: A Review. *Organohalogen Compounds*, 70, 000527-000530.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1992). The Mount Liamuiga Crater Trail. *Heritage Magazine of St. Kitts*, 3(2).

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1993). High School Biogas Project to Prevent Deforestation On St. Kitts. *Biomass Users Network*, 7(1).

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

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

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

Presentations:

Rosenfeld, P.E., Sutherland, A; Hesse, R.; Zapata, A. (October 3-6, 2013). Air dispersion modeling of volatile organic emissions from multiple natural gas wells in Decatur, TX. *44th Western Regional Meeting, American Chemical Society*. Lecture conducted from Santa Clara, CA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Teaching Experience:

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.C. Berkeley, Environmental Science Program Teaching Assistant for Environmental Science 10.

Academic Grants Awarded:

California Integrated Waste Management Board. \$41,000 grant awarded to UCLA Institute of the Environment. Goal: To investigate effect of high carbon wood ash on volatile organic emissions from compost. 2001.

Synagro Technologies, Corona California: \$10,000 grant awarded to San Diego State University. Goal: investigate effect of biosolids for restoration and remediation of degraded coastal sage soils. 2000.

King County, Department of Research and Technology, Washington State. \$100,000 grant awarded to University of Washington: Goal: To investigate odor emissions from biosolids application and the effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions. 1998.

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

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

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

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

Deposition and/or Trial Testimony:

- In the United States District Court For The District of New Jersey
Duarte et al, *Plaintiffs*, vs. United States Metals Refining Company et. al. *Defendant*.
Case No.: 2:17-cv-01624-ES-SCM
Rosenfeld Deposition. 6-7-2019
- In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division
M/T Carla Maersk, *Plaintiffs*, vs. Conti 168., Schiffahrts-GMBH & Co. Bulker KG MS “Conti Perdido”
Defendant.
Case No.: 3:15-CV-00106 consolidated with 3:15-CV-00237
Rosenfeld Deposition. 5-9-2019
- In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles – Santa Monica
Carole-Taddeo-Bates et al., vs. Ifran Khan et al., Defendants
Case No.: No. BC615636
Rosenfeld Deposition, 1-26-2019
- In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles – Santa Monica
The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments et al. vs El Adobe Apts. Inc. et al., Defendants
Case No.: No. BC646857
Rosenfeld Deposition, 10-6-2018; Trial 3-7-19
- In United States District Court For The District of Colorado
Bells et al. Plaintiff vs. The 3M Company et al., Defendants
Case: No 1:16-cv-02531-RBJ
Rosenfeld Deposition, 3-15-2018 and 4-3-2018
- In The District Court Of Regan County, Texas, 112th Judicial District
Phillip Bales et al., Plaintiff vs. Dow Agrosiences, LLC, et al., Defendants
Cause No 1923
Rosenfeld Deposition, 11-17-2017
- In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Contra Costa
Simons et al., Plaintiffs vs. Chevron Corporation, et al., Defendants
Cause No C12-01481
Rosenfeld Deposition, 11-20-2017
- In The Circuit Court Of The Twentieth Judicial Circuit, St Clair County, Illinois
Martha Custer et al., Plaintiff vs. Cerro Flow Products, Inc., Defendants
Case No.: No. 0i9-L-2295
Rosenfeld Deposition, 8-23-2017
- In The Superior Court of the State of California, For The County of Los Angeles
Warrn Gilbert and Penny Gilber, Plaintiff vs. BMW of North America LLC
Case No.: LC102019 (c/w BC582154)
Rosenfeld Deposition, 8-16-2017, Trail 8-28-2018
- In the Northern District Court of Mississippi, Greenville Division
Brenda J. Cooper, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Meritor Inc., et al., *Defendants*
Case Number: 4:16-cv-52-DMB-JVM
Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2017

In The Superior Court of the State of Washington, County of Snohomish
Michael Davis and Julie Davis et al., Plaintiff vs. Cedar Grove Composting Inc., Defendants
Case No.: No. 13-2-03987-5
Rosenfeld Deposition, February 2017
Trial, March 2017

In The Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda
Charles Spain., Plaintiff vs. Thermo Fisher Scientific, et al., Defendants
Case No.: RG14711115
Rosenfeld Deposition, September 2015

In The Iowa District Court In And For Poweshiek County
Russell D. Winburn, et al., Plaintiffs vs. Doug Hoksbergen, et al., Defendants
Case No.: LALA002187
Rosenfeld Deposition, August 2015

In The Iowa District Court For Wapello County
Jerry Dovico, et al., Plaintiffs vs. Valley View Sine LLC, et al., Defendants
Law No.: LALA105144 - Division A
Rosenfeld Deposition, August 2015

In The Iowa District Court For Wapello County
Doug Pauls, et al., et al., Plaintiffs vs. Richard Warren, et al., Defendants
Law No.: LALA105144 - Division A
Rosenfeld Deposition, August 2015

In The Circuit Court of Ohio County, West Virginia
Robert Andrews, et al. v. Antero, et al.
Civil Action NO. 14-C-30000
Rosenfeld Deposition, June 2015

In The Third Judicial District County of Dona Ana, New Mexico
Betty Gonzalez, et al. Plaintiffs vs. Del Oro Dairy, Del Oro Real Estate LLC, Jerry Settles and Deward
DeRuyter, Defendants
Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2015

In The Iowa District Court For Muscatine County
Laurie Freeman et. al. Plaintiffs vs. Grain Processing Corporation, Defendant
Case No 4980
Rosenfeld Deposition: May 2015

In the Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit, in and For Broward County, Florida
Walter Hinton, et. al. Plaintiff, vs. City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, a Municipality, Defendant.
Case Number CACE07030358 (26)
Rosenfeld Deposition: December 2014

In the United States District Court Western District of Oklahoma
Tommy McCarty, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Oklahoma City Landfill, LLC d/b/a Southeast Oklahoma City
Landfill, et al. Defendants.
Case No. 5:12-cv-01152-C
Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2014

In the County Court of Dallas County Texas
Lisa Parr et al, *Plaintiff*, vs. Aruba et al, *Defendant*.
Case Number cc-11-01650-E
Rosenfeld Deposition: March and September 2013
Rosenfeld Trial: April 2014

In the Court of Common Pleas of Tuscarawas County Ohio
John Michael Abicht, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Republic Services, Inc., et al., *Defendants*
Case Number: 2008 CT 10 0741 (Cons. w/ 2009 CV 10 0987)
Rosenfeld Deposition: October 2012

In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division
Kyle Cannon, Eugene Donovan, Genaro Ramirez, Carol Sassler, and Harvey Walton, each Individually and on behalf of those similarly situated, *Plaintiffs*, vs. BP Products North America, Inc., *Defendant*.
Case 3:10-cv-00622
Rosenfeld Deposition: February 2012
Rosenfeld Trial: April 2013

In the Circuit Court of Baltimore County Maryland
Philip E. Cvach, II et al., *Plaintiffs* vs. Two Farms, Inc. d/b/a Royal Farms, Defendants
Case Number: 03-C-12-012487 OT
Rosenfeld Deposition: September 2013

EXHIBIT C



1640 5th St., Suite 204 Santa
Santa Monica, California 90401
Tel: (949) 887-9013
Email: mhagemann@swape.com

Matthew F. Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg., QSD, QSP

**Geologic and Hydrogeologic Characterization
Industrial Stormwater Compliance
Investigation and Remediation Strategies
Litigation Support and Testifying Expert
CEQA Review**

Education:

M.S. Degree, Geology, California State University Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 1984.

B.A. Degree, Geology, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA, 1982.

Professional Certifications:

California Professional Geologist

California Certified Hydrogeologist

Qualified SWPPP Developer and Practitioner

Professional Experience:

Matt has 25 years of experience in environmental policy, assessment and remediation. He spent nine years with the U.S. EPA in the RCRA and Superfund programs and served as EPA's Senior Science Policy Advisor in the Western Regional Office where he identified emerging threats to groundwater from perchlorate and MTBE. While with EPA, Matt also served as a Senior Hydrogeologist in the oversight of the assessment of seven major military facilities undergoing base closure. He led numerous enforcement actions under provisions of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) while also working with permit holders to improve hydrogeologic characterization and water quality monitoring.

Matt has worked closely with U.S. EPA legal counsel and the technical staff of several states in the application and enforcement of RCRA, Safe Drinking Water Act and Clean Water Act regulations. Matt has trained the technical staff in the States of California, Hawaii, Nevada, Arizona and the Territory of Guam in the conduct of investigations, groundwater fundamentals, and sampling techniques.

Positions Matt has held include:

- Founding Partner, Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE) (2003 – present);
- Geology Instructor, Golden West College, 2010 – 2014;
- Senior Environmental Analyst, Komex H2O Science, Inc. (2000 -- 2003);

- Executive Director, Orange Coast Watch (2001 – 2004);
- Senior Science Policy Advisor and Hydrogeologist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (1989–1998);
- Hydrogeologist, National Park Service, Water Resources Division (1998 – 2000);
- Adjunct Faculty Member, San Francisco State University, Department of Geosciences (1993 – 1998);
- Instructor, College of Marin, Department of Science (1990 – 1995);
- Geologist, U.S. Forest Service (1986 – 1998); and
- Geologist, Dames & Moore (1984 – 1986).

Senior Regulatory and Litigation Support Analyst:

With SWAPE, Matt’s responsibilities have included:

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

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

- Senior author of a report on the extent of perchlorate contamination that was used in testimony by the former U.S. EPA Administrator and General Counsel.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of MTBE use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of perchlorate use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in a study that estimates nationwide costs for MTBE remediation and drinking water treatment, results of which were published in newspapers nationwide and in testimony against provisions of an energy bill that would limit liability for oil companies.
- Research to support litigation to restore drinking water supplies that have been contaminated by MTBE in California and New York.

- Expert witness testimony in a case of oil production-related contamination in Mississippi.
- Lead author for a multi-volume remedial investigation report for an operating school in Los Angeles that met strict regulatory requirements and rigorous deadlines.

- Development of strategic approaches for cleanup of contaminated sites in consultation with clients and regulators.

Executive Director:

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

Hydrogeology:

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

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

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

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

- Received an EPA Bronze Medal for his contribution to the development of national guidance for the protection of drinking water.
- Managed the Sole Source Aquifer Program and protected the drinking water of two communities through designation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. He prepared geologic reports, conducted public hearings, and responded to public comments from residents who were very concerned about the impact of designation.

- Reviewed a number of Environmental Impact Statements for planned major developments, including large hazardous and solid waste disposal facilities, mine reclamation, and water transfer.

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

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

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

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

Policy:

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

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

Geology:

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

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

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

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

Teaching:

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

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

Matt taught physical geology (lecture and lab and introductory geology at Golden West College in Huntington Beach, California from 2010 to 2014.

Invited Testimony, Reports, Papers and Presentations:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other Experience:

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

May 18, 2021

Gena Guisar
Planner
City of Carson, Planning Department
701 East Carson Street
Carson, California 90745
gguisar@carsonca.gov

Dear Gena Guisar:

Thank you for providing the California Air Resources Board (CARB) with the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the District at South Bay Specific Plan (Project) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), State Clearinghouse No. 2005051059. The Project would allow for the construction and operation of 1,250 residential units, 696,500 square feet of regional commercial uses, 15,000 square feet of restaurant uses, and 1,567,090 square feet of light industrial uses. The Project is located in the City of Carson (City), California, which is the lead agency for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) purposes.

CARB is concerned about the air pollution and health risk impacts that may result from the Project. The Project proposes the development of light industrial land uses that will increase the number of daily heavy-duty diesel truck trips and introduce new emissions from the operation of on-site equipment (e.g., forklifts, yard tractors, and transport refrigeration units). This increase in activity will negatively impact local air quality with health-harming emissions, including particulate matter, diesel particulate matter (diesel PM), and other toxic air contaminants, generated during the construction and operation of the Project. These air pollutant emissions also contribute to regional air pollution by emitting precursors that lead to the formation of secondary air pollutants, like ozone, and contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.¹

The Project area sits both in, and adjacent to, several communities already suffering from the highest pollution burdens in the State. As explained below, CARB has selected Wilmington/West Long Beach/Carson Community, which encompasses the Project area, as a community that, due to its high pollution burden, requires the creation of a community emissions reduction plan (CERP), to significantly reduce emissions within the community. Therefore, it is imperative that the city ensure that its land use decisions, including its

1. With regard to greenhouse gas emissions from this project, CARB has been clear that local governments and project proponents have a responsibility to properly mitigate these impacts. CARB's guidance, set out in detail in the Scoping Plan issued in 2017, makes clear that in CARB's expert view, local mitigation is critical to achieving climate goals and reducing greenhouse gases below levels of significance.

decision on this Project, are consistent with the Wilmington/West Long Beach/Carson Community CERP, in its entirety.

The Industrial Uses Will Increase Exposure to Air Pollution in Disadvantaged Communities

The proposed light industrial land uses will undoubtedly expose the nearby disadvantaged communities to increased levels of air pollution. Addressing the disproportionate impacts that air pollution has on disadvantaged communities is a pressing concern across the State, as evidenced by statutory requirements compelling California's public agencies to target these communities for clean air investment, pollution mitigation, and environmental regulation. The following three pieces of legislation need to be considered and included in the DEIR when developing a project like this in a disadvantaged community:

Senate Bill 535 (De León, 2012)

Senate Bill 535 (De León, Chapter 830, 2012)² recognizes the potential vulnerability of low-income and disadvantaged communities to poor air quality and requires funds to be spent to benefit disadvantaged communities. The California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) is charged with the duty to identify disadvantaged communities. CalEPA bases its identification of these communities on geographic, socioeconomic, public health, and environmental hazard criteria (Health and Safety Code, section 39711, subsection (a)). In this capacity, CalEPA currently defines a disadvantaged community, from an environmental hazard and socioeconomic standpoint, as a community that scores within the top 25 percent of the census tracts, as analyzed by the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool Version 3.0 (CalEnviroScreen).³ This Project falls within the boundary of the Wilmington/West Long Beach/Carson Community. The maximum CalEnviroScreen score for the Wilmington/West Long Beach/Carson Community is in the top 1 percent, indicating that the area is home to some of the most vulnerable neighborhoods in the State. The air pollution levels in the Wilmington/West Long Beach/Carson Community routinely exceed State and federal air quality standards. CARB urges the city to ensure that the Project does not adversely impact neighboring disadvantaged communities.

Senate Bill 1000 (Leyva, 2016)

Senate Bill 1000 (SB 1000) (Leyva, Chapter 587, Statutes of 2016)⁴ amended California's Planning and Zoning Law. SB 1000 requires local governments that have identified disadvantaged communities to incorporate the addition of an environmental justice element

2. Senate Bill 535, De León, K., Chapter 800, Statutes of 2012, modified the California Health and Safety Code, adding § 39711, § 39713, § 39715, § 39721 and § 39723.

3. "CalEnviroScreen 3.0." Oehha.ca.gov, California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, June 2018, <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/report/calenviroscreen-30>.

4. Senate Bill 1000, Leyva, S., Chapter 587, Statutes of 2016, amended the California Health and Safety Code, § 65302.

into their general plans upon the adoption or next revision of two or more elements concurrently on or after January 1, 2018. SB 1000 requires environmental justice elements to identify objectives and policies to reduce unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities. Generally, environmental justice elements will include policies to reduce the community's exposure to pollution through air quality improvement. SB 1000 affirms the need to integrate environmental justice principles into the planning process to prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities.

Assembly Bill 617 (Garcia, 2017)

The State of California has emphasized protecting local communities from the harmful effects of air pollution through the passage of Assembly Bill 617 (AB 617) (Garcia, Chapter 136, Statutes of 2017).⁵ AB 617 requires CARB to direct the process that creates new community-focused and community-driven action to reduce air pollution and improve public health in communities that experience disproportionate burdens from exposure to air pollutants. In response to AB 617, CARB established the Community Air Protection Program with the goal of reducing exposure in communities heavily impacted by air pollution. As part of its role in implementing AB 617, CARB must annually consider the selection of communities for development and implementation of community air monitoring plans and/or community emission reduction programs for those communities affected by a high cumulative exposure burden. The Wilmington/West Long Beach/Carson Community is one of 15 communities statewide chosen thus far for development of these plans.

The Wilmington/West Long Beach/Carson Community was selected for both community air monitoring and the development of a CERP due to its high cumulative exposure burden, the presence of a significant number of sensitive populations (children, elderly, and individuals with pre-existing conditions), and the socioeconomic challenges experienced by its residents. On September 10, 2020, CARB approved the community's CERP, making it a legally enforceable emission reduction program. The CERP included several strategies to achieve emission reductions throughout this community, including significantly reducing or eliminating emissions from heavy-duty mobile sources and industrial stationary sources.

Health-harming emissions, including particulate matter (PM), toxic air contaminants, and diesel PM generated from the proposed light industrial development in the Project area will negatively impact the community, which is already disproportionately impacted by air pollution from existing freight, port and refinery operations as well as stationary sources of air pollution. Part of the AB 617 process required CARB and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to create a highly-resolved inventory of air pollution sources

5. Assembly Bill 617, Garcia, C., Chapter 136, Statutes of 2017, modified the California Health and Safety Code, amending § 40920.6, § 42400, and § 42402, and adding § 39607.1, § 40920.8, § 42411, § 42705.5, and § 44391.2.

within this community. CARB would be happy to share and discuss this community emissions inventory with the city to aid in the DEIR's cumulative impact analysis.

The DEIR Should Quantify and Discuss the Potential Cancer Risks from Project Operation

Since the light industrial land uses proposed under the Project are near residential communities that are already burdened by multiple air pollution sources, CARB urges the city to prepare a health risk assessment (HRA) for the Project. The HRA should account for all potential operational health risks from Project-related diesel PM emission sources, including, but not limited to, back-up generators, on-site diesel-powered equipment, and heavy-duty trucks. The HRA must account for operation of the full buildout of the Project before it can consider approving the Project. The HRA should also determine if the operation of the Project in conjunction with the operation of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects or activities would result in a cumulative cancer risk impact on nearby residences. To reduce diesel PM exposure and associated cancer risks, CARB urges the city to include all the air pollution reduction measures listed in Attachment A of this comment letter in the HRA and DEIR.

The project description in the NOP does not state whether the light industrial uses proposed under the Project would include cold storage warehouses. Project descriptions "must include (a) the precise location and boundaries of the proposed project, (b) a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project, (c) a general description of the project's technical, economic and environmental characteristics, and (d) a statement briefly describing the intended use of the EIR." (*stopthemillenniumhollywood.com v. City of Los Angeles* (2019) 39 Cal.App.5th 1, 16.) "This description of the project is an indispensable element of both a valid draft EIR and final EIR." (*Ibid.*) Given this mandate to include a complete project description, CARB urges the city to prepare an EIR that addresses the impacts from the full buildout of the Project area.

Since the Project description provided in the NOP does not explicitly state that the proposed industrial land uses would not be used for cold storage, there is a possibility that trucks and trailers visiting the Project-site would be equipped with transport refrigeration units (TRU).⁶ TRUs on trucks and trailers can emit large quantities of diesel exhaust while operating within the Project-site. Residences and other sensitive receptors (e.g., daycare facilities, senior care facilities, and schools) located near where these TRUs could be operating, would be exposed to diesel exhaust emissions that would result in a significant cancer risk impact to the nearby community. If the industrial land uses proposed under the Project would be used for cold storage, CARB urges the city to model air pollutant emissions from on-site TRUs in the DEIR, as well as include potential cancer risks from on-site TRUs in the Project's HRA.

6. TRUs are refrigeration systems powered by integral diesel engines that protect perishable goods during transport in an insulated truck and trailer vans, rail cars, and domestic shipping containers.

If the Project will not be used for cold storage, CARB urges the city to include one of the following design measures in the DEIR:

- A Project design measure requiring contractual language in tenant lease agreements that prohibits tenants from operating TRUs within the Project-site; or
- A condition requiring a restrictive covenant over the parcel that prohibits the applicant's use of TRUs on the property unless the applicant seeks and receives an amendment to its conditional use permit allowing such use.

The HRA prepared in support of the Project should be based on the latest Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's (OEHHA) guidance (2015 Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments),⁷ and CARB's Hot Spots Analysis and Reporting Program (HARP2 model). The Project's mobile diesel PM emissions used to estimate the Project's cancer risk impacts should be based on CARB's latest 2021 Emission Factors model (EMFAC2021). Mobile emission factors can be easily obtained by running the EMFAC2021 Web Database: <https://arb.ca.gov/emfac>.

The HRA should evaluate and present the existing baseline (current conditions), future baseline (full build-out year, without the Project), and future year with the Project. The health risks modeled under both the existing and the future baselines should reflect all applicable federal, state, and local rules and regulations. By evaluating health risks using both baselines, the public and planners will have a complete understanding of the potential health impacts that would result from the Project.

The DEIR Should Quantify and Discuss the Potential Cancer Risks from Project Construction

In addition to the health risks associated with operational diesel PM emissions, health risks associated with construction diesel PM emissions should also be included in the air quality section of the DEIR and the Project's HRA. Construction of the Project would result in short-term diesel PM emissions from the use of both on-road and off-road diesel equipment. The OEHHA guidance recommends assessing cancer risks for construction projects lasting longer than two months. Since construction of the Project would very likely occur over a period lasting longer than two months, the HRA prepared for the Project should include health risks for existing residences near the Project-site during construction.

The HRA should account for all diesel PM emission sources related to Project construction, including, but not limited to, off-road mobile equipment, diesel generators, and on-road heavy-duty trucks. As previously stated in Section II of this letter, the cancer risks evaluated in the construction HRA should be based on the latest OEHHA guidance and CARB's HARP2

7. Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. February 2015. Accessed at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crn/2015guidancemanual.pdf>.

model. The cancer risks reported in the HRA should be calculated using the latest emission factors obtained from CARB's latest EMFAC (currently EMFAC 2021) and Off-road models.

Conclusion

To reduce the exposure of toxic diesel PM emissions in disadvantaged communities already impacted by air pollution, the final design of the Project should include all existing and emerging zero-emission technologies to minimize diesel PM and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions, as well as the GHGs that contribute to climate change. CARB encourages the city to implement the measures listed in Attachment A of this comment letter to reduce the Project's construction and operational air pollution emissions.

Given the breadth and scope of projects subject to CEQA review throughout California that have air quality and greenhouse gas impacts, coupled with CARB's limited staff resources to substantively respond to all issues associated with a project, CARB must prioritize its substantive comments here based on staff time, resources, and its assessment of impacts. CARB's deliberate decision to substantively comment on some issues does not constitute an admission or concession that it substantively agrees with the lead agency's findings and conclusions on any issues on which CARB does not substantively submit comments.

CARB appreciates the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the Project and can provide assistance on zero-emission technologies and emission reduction strategies, as needed. Please include CARB on your State Clearinghouse list of selected state agencies that will receive the DEIR as part of the comment period. If you have questions, please contact Stanley Armstrong, Air Pollution Specialist via email at stanley.armstrong@arb.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Robert Krieger, Branch Chief, Risk Reduction Branch

Attachment

cc: See next page.

cc: State Clearinghouse
state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

Carlo De La Cruz, Senior Campaign Representative, Sierra Club
carlo.delacruz@sierraclub.org

Lijin Sun, Program Supervisor, CEQA Intergovernmental Review, South Coast Air
Quality Management District
lsun@aqmd.gov

Morgan Capilla, NEPA Reviewer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Air Division,
Region 9
capilla.morgan@epa.gov

Taylor Thomas, Research and Policy Analyst, East Yard Communities for Environmental
Justice
tbthomas@eycej.org

Ed Alma Marquez, Policy Analyst, Center for Community Action and Environmental
Justice
alma.m@ccaaj.org

Stanley Armstrong, Air Pollution Specialist, Risk Reduction Branch

Attachment A

ATTACHMENT A

Recommended Air Pollution Emission Reduction Measures for Warehouses and Distribution Centers

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) recommends developers and government planners use all existing and emerging zero to near-zero emission technologies during project construction and operation to minimize public exposure to air pollution. Below are some measures, currently recommended by CARB, specific to warehouse and distribution center projects. These recommendations are subject to change as new zero-emission technologies become available.

Recommended Construction Measures

1. Ensure the cleanest possible construction practices and equipment are used. This includes eliminating the idling of diesel-powered equipment and providing the necessary infrastructure (e.g., electrical hookups) to support zero and near-zero equipment and tools.
2. Implement, and plan accordingly for, the necessary infrastructure to support the zero and near-zero emission technology vehicles and equipment that will be operating on site. Necessary infrastructure may include the physical (e.g., needed footprint), energy, and fueling infrastructure for construction equipment, on-site vehicles and equipment, and medium-heavy and heavy-heavy duty trucks.
3. In construction contracts, include language that requires all off-road diesel-powered equipment used during construction to be equipped with Tier 4 or cleaner engines, except for specialized construction equipment in which Tier 4 engines are not available. In place of Tier 4 engines, off-road equipment can incorporate retrofits, such that, emission reductions achieved equal to or exceed that of a Tier 4 engine.
4. In construction contracts, include language that requires all off-road equipment with a power rating below 19 kilowatts (e.g., plate compactors, pressure washers) used during project construction be battery powered.
5. In construction contracts, include language that requires all heavy-duty trucks entering the construction site, during the grading and building construction phases be model year 2014 or later. All heavy-duty haul trucks should also meet CARB's lowest optional low-oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) standard starting in the year 2022.¹

1. In 2013, CARB adopted optional low-NO_x emission standards for on-road heavy-duty engines. CARB encourages engine manufacturers to introduce new technologies to reduce NO_x emissions below the current mandatory on-road heavy-duty diesel engine emission standards for model-year 2010 and later. CARB's optional low-NO_x emission standard is available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/optional-reduced-nox-standards>.

6. In construction contracts, include language that requires all construction equipment and fleets to be in compliance with all current air quality regulations. CARB is available to assist in implementing this recommendation.

Recommended Operation Measures

1. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires tenants to use the cleanest technologies available, and to provide the necessary infrastructure to support zero-emission vehicles and equipment that will be operating on site.
2. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires all loading/unloading docks and trailer spaces be equipped with electrical hookups for trucks with transport refrigeration units (TRU) or auxiliary power units. This requirement will substantially decrease the amount of time that a TRU powered by a fossil-fueled internal combustion engine can operate at the project site. Use of zero-emission all-electric plug-in TRUs, hydrogen fuel cell transport refrigeration, and cryogenic transport refrigeration are encouraged and can also be included in lease agreements.²
3. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires all TRUs entering the project-site be plug-in capable.
4. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires future tenants to exclusively use zero-emission light and medium-duty delivery trucks and vans.
5. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements requiring all TRUs, trucks, and cars entering the project site be zero-emission.
6. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires all service equipment (e.g., yard hostlers, yard equipment, forklifts, and pallet jacks) used within the project site to be zero-emission. This equipment is widely available.
7. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires all heavy-duty trucks entering or on the project site to be model year 2014 or later, expedite a transition to zero-emission vehicles, and be fully zero-emission beginning in 2030.
8. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires the tenant be in, and monitor compliance with, all current air quality regulations for on-road trucks

2. CARB's technology assessment for transport refrigerators provides information on the current and projected development of TRUs, including current and anticipated costs. The assessment is available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/tech/techreport/tru_07292015.pdf.

including CARB's Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) Greenhouse Gas Regulation,³ Periodic Smoke Inspection Program (PSIP),⁴ and the Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation.⁵

9. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements restricting trucks and support equipment from idling longer than five minutes while on site.
10. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that limits on-site TRU diesel engine runtime to no longer than 15 minutes. If no cold storage operations are planned, include contractual language and permit conditions that prohibit cold storage operations unless a health risk assessment is conducted, and the health impacts fully mitigated.
11. Include rooftop solar panels for each proposed warehouse to the extent feasible, with a capacity that matches the maximum allowed for distributed solar connections to the grid.
12. Including language in tenant lease agreements, requiring the installing of vegetative walls⁶ or other effective barriers that separate loading docks and people living or working nearby.

3. In December 2008, CARB adopted a regulation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by improving the fuel efficiency of heavy-duty tractors that pull 53-foot or longer box-type trailers. The regulation applies primarily to owners of 53-foot or longer box-type trailers, including both dry-van and refrigerated-van trailers, and owners of the heavy-duty tractors that pull them on California highways. CARB's Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) Greenhouse Gas Regulation is available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ttghg>.

4. The PSIP program requires that diesel and bus fleet owners conduct annual smoke opacity inspections of their vehicles and repair those with excessive smoke emissions to ensure compliance. CARB's PSIP program is available at: <https://www.arb.ca.gov/enf/hdvp/hdvp.htm>.

5. The regulation requires that newer heavier trucks and buses must meet particulate matter filter requirements beginning January 1, 2012. Lighter and older heavier trucks must be replaced starting January 1, 2015. By January 1, 2023, nearly all trucks and buses will need to have 2010 model-year engines or equivalent. CARB's Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation is available at: <https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm>.

6. Effectiveness of Sound Wall-Vegetation Combination Barriers as Near-Roadway Pollutant Mitigation Strategies (2017) is available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/research/apr/past/13-306.pdf>.

***APPENDIX A2 SCOPING MEETING
PRESENTATION AND LIST OF
ATTENDEES AT APRIL 29,
2021, SCOPING MEETING***



The District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment

*2021 Supplemental Environmental Impact
Report (SEIR)*

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

April 29, 2021



Scoping Meeting Agenda

City
Welcome
and
Introductions

CEQA and
Project
Presentation

Receipt of
Public
Comments

City Welcome and Introductions

- Welcome
- Introductions/Panelists



Gena Guisar, AICP
Project Planner
Saied Naaseh
Director of Community
Development
John Raymond
Assistant City Manager



Terri Avila
CEQA Consultant (SEIR Project Manager)
Jacqueline De La Rocha
CEQA Consultant
(SEIR Deputy Project Manager)



CEQA and Project Presentation

Topics Covered in the Scoping Meeting

Purpose of
Scoping
Meeting

Description
of 2021
Project

Environmental
Review
Process

Environmental
Issue
Areas to be
Studied in the
Draft SEIR

Solicit
Scoping
Comments

Purpose of Scoping Meeting

Purpose of the Scoping Meeting

- The City has decided to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)
- The purpose of this scoping meeting is to obtain oral and/or written comments from agencies, organizations, and/or the public on the scope and contents of the SEIR
- The scoping meeting occurs within the 30-day comment period provided by the Notice of Preparation, which allows for written comments to be submitted between April 16, 2021, through May 17, 2021

Key Players in the Scoping Meeting and CEQA Process



City of Carson

Lead Agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)




Environmental Science Associates

Environmental consultant under contract with the City and working under the guidance of the City to prepare the Draft SEIR

Description of 2021 Project

Project Location





Existing On- and Off-Site Land Uses

- The 157 Acre Site is currently undeveloped but was used as a landfill site between 1959 and 1965 for the deposition of waste/refuse from areas throughout Los Angeles County.




2021 Project: Light Industrial Uses

-  Fulfillment Centers
-  Distribution Centers

Planning Areas 3 – Proposed Uses

Industrial Uses
(identified as light industrial uses
in the Specific Plan Amendment,
however, modeled as fulfillment
and distribution/parcel hub uses)

- 803,300 square feet of fulfillment uses
- 763,790 square feet of distribution/parcel hub uses
- **Total of 1,567,090 square feet of industrial uses**



2021 Project: Carson Country Mart


Planning Areas 3 – Proposed Uses

Commercial Uses (within the Carson Country Mart)

- 10,000 square foot retail space
- 12,600 square feet for up to four restaurants (a gourmet or upscale drive-thru and pickup restaurants/facilities)
- 9,000 square feet of flexible food and beverage kiosks
- 2,200 square foot cafe
- **Total of 33,800 square feet of commercial uses**



2021 Project: Park and Open Space



Planning Areas 3 – Proposed Uses

Park and Open Space

11.74 acres of passive and active publicly accessible but privately maintained open space and amenity areas:

- 11.12 acres in Carson Country Mart
- 0.62 acres in an enhanced parkway along Lenardo Drive

Comparison of 2018 and 2021 Projects

Planning Area	Land Use	2018 Project	2021 Project	Notes
Planning Area 1	Residential	1,250 Units (Maximum)	1,250 Units (Maximum)	No change
Planning Area 2	Regional Commercial	711,500 sf	711,500 sf	No change
Planning Area 3	Commercial/Retail	890,000 sf	33,800 sf	<u>Decrease</u> of 856,200 sf
	Hotel	233,333 sf (350 rooms)	N/A	<u>Decrease</u> of 233,333 sf
	Light Industrial (with ancillary office)	N/A	1,567,090	<u>Increase</u> of 1,567,090 sf
	Total (sf)	1,123,333 sf	1,600,890 sf	<u>Increase</u> of 477,557 sf
	Park and Open Space	N/A	11.74 acres	<u>Increase</u> of 11.74 acres


Environmental Review Process

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

- Purpose of CEQA
 - Inform decision-makers and public of a project's potential environmental effects
 - Applies to discretionary projects
 - Increase public understanding of and participation in environmental review process
 - Disclose potential impacts on the environment
 - Identify ways to avoid or reduce potential impacts through mitigation measures or alternatives

SEIR Process

 = Opportunities for Public Input



Environmental Issue Areas to be Studied in the Draft SEIR

Environmental Issues Resulting in No Impacts

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Wildfire

Environmental Issues to be Addressed in the Draft SEIR

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems

Solicit Scoping Comments

Focus of Scoping Comments

- Focus comments on the scope and content of the Draft EIR for the 2021 District at South Bay Specific Plan Amendment, including ways to avoid or reduce potential impacts (mitigation measures and/or alternatives)
- Comments on the project itself, other projects in the City, or other issues of concern can be directed to Gena Guisar:
 - E-mail: GGuisar@carsonca.gov
 - Phone: (310) 830-7600 Ext. 1323

How to Provide an Oral Comment

- If you joined via internet browser or the Zoom desktop or mobile app, please click the “Raise Hand” icon to request to be called upon for comment
- If you joined via call-in telephone number, please press *9 on your keypad to “Raise Hand” via telephone
- We will notify you when you can unmute and begin your comment

Guidelines for Providing Oral Comments

- Commenters will be called upon in the order that comment requests are received
- Commenters will have 2 minutes and one opportunity to speak
- A timer will be visible on screen to show time remaining to speak
- Oral comments are also strongly encouraged to be submitted in writing

How to Submit Written Comments

- Written comments can be provided in the chat function of this zoom meeting; they will be provided with verbal responses as part of this scoping meeting, as appropriate
- Written comments can also be submitted by May 17, 2021, which is the end of the Notice of Preparation comment period, to:

**Ms. Gena Guisar, Planner
City of Carson**

Community Development Department
701 East Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745

gguisar@carsonca.gov

Thank you

for your participation in this
important public process!

Attendee Report

Report Generated 4/30/2021 9:10

Topic	Webinar ID	Actual Start Time	Actual Duration (min)	# Registered	# Cancelled	Unique Viewers	Total Users	Max Concurrent Views
The District at S	821 1536 5138	4/29/2021 16:18	73	18	0	13	24	0

Host Details

Attended	User Name (Original Name)	Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Time in Session (minutes)	Country/Region Name
Yes	ESA Production (Steven John	sjohnson@esassoc.com	4/29/2021 16:18	4/29/2021 17:31	73	United States

Panelist Details

Attended	User Name (Original Name)	Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Time in Session (minutes)	Country/Region Name
Yes	Danny Aleshire	danny.aleshire@awattorneys.cc	4/29/2021 17:03	4/29/2021 17:31	28	United States
Yes	Saied Naaseh	snaaseh@carsonca.gov	4/29/2021 16:55	4/29/2021 17:31	36	United States
Yes	John Raymond	jraymond@carsonca.gov	4/29/2021 17:14	4/29/2021 17:31	18	United States
Yes	Gena Guisar	gguisar@carsonca.gov	4/29/2021 16:31	4/29/2021 17:31	61	United States
Yes	Jacqueline De La Rocha	jdelarocha@esassoc.com	4/29/2021 16:32	4/29/2021 17:31	60	United States
Yes	Terri Avila	tavila@esassoc.com	4/29/2021 16:39	4/29/2021 17:31	52	United States

Attendee Details

Attended	User Name (Original Name)	First Name	Last Name	Email	Registration Time	Approval Status	Join Time	Leave Time	Time in Session (minutes)	Country/Region Name
Yes	TORY FREEMAN	TORY	FREEMAN	TFREEMAN@CARSONCA.GOV	4/20/2021 13:22	approved	4/29/2021 17:00	4/29/2021 17:31	31	United States
Yes	Benjamin Anderson	Benjamin	Anderson	benjamin@officeuntitled.com	4/29/2021 13:07	approved	4/29/2021 17:01	4/29/2021 17:31	30	United States
Yes	Erin Dibos	Erin	Dibos	edibos@ojb.com	4/28/2021 8:40	approved	4/29/2021 17:00	4/29/2021 17:31	31	United States
No	Steven	Steven	Johnson	sdjohnson316@yahoo.com	4/28/2021 16:25	denied	--	--	--	
Yes	Dave Rand	Dave	Rand	dave@agd-landuse.com	4/29/2021 17:02	approved	4/29/2021 17:03	4/29/2021 17:04	1	United States
Yes	Dave Rand	Dave	Rand	dave@agd-landuse.com			4/29/2021 17:03	4/29/2021 17:31	28	United States
Yes	Ryan Kim	Ryan	Kim	rkim@carsonca.gov	4/29/2021 16:57	approved	4/29/2021 17:00	4/29/2021 17:31	31	United States
Yes	Mary Hashem	Mary	Hashem	mary@resolutionsdev.com	4/29/2021 16:54	approved	4/29/2021 17:00	4/29/2021 17:31	31	United States
Yes	Mike Gill	Mike	Gill	mike@rga-architects.com	4/29/2021 17:03	approved	4/29/2021 17:03	4/29/2021 17:08	6	United States
Yes	Alex Smith	Alex	Smith	alex@faring.com	4/29/2021 17:06	approved	4/29/2021 17:06	4/29/2021 17:30	24	United States
Yes	Doug Carstens	Doug	Carstens	dpc@cbcearthlaw.com	4/29/2021 17:03	approved	4/29/2021 17:04	4/29/2021 17:31	28	United States
Yes	Olga Abels	Olga	Abels	olga@faring.com	4/29/2021 16:47	approved	4/29/2021 17:00	4/29/2021 17:01	1	United States
No	M	M	Croes	javaman31@hotmail.com	4/20/2021 14:22	approved	--	--	--	
Yes	Rick Carrell	Rick	Carrell	carrell@michaelbakerintl.com	4/29/2021 16:00	approved	4/29/2021 17:00	4/29/2021 17:31	31	United States
Yes	Nicholas Lowe	Nicholas	Lowe	nick.lowe@webbassociates.com	4/27/2021 14:28	approved	4/29/2021 17:02	4/29/2021 17:31	30	United States
No	Barry	Barry	Spradling	barry.spradling@yahoo.com	4/22/2021 11:25	approved	--	--	--	
No	Darren	Darren	Embry	darren@faring.com	4/29/2021 12:56	approved	--	--	--	
Yes	Jason I	Jason	I	jason@faring.com	4/29/2021 17:06	approved	4/29/2021 17:06	4/29/2021 17:31	25	United States
No	Julio Cesar	Julio Cesar	Avila	jc_avila@live.com	4/16/2021 18:16	approved	--	--	--	

Other Attended

User Name	Join Time	Leave Time	Time in Session (min)	Country/Region Name
13104879945	4/29/2021 17:07	4/29/2021 17:31	25	United States
13109624822	4/29/2021 17:02	4/29/2021 17:31	30	United States
19494337019	4/29/2021 17:19	4/29/2021 17:30	11	United States

