



April 4, 2016

The Honorable Jose Huizar
Chair, Planning and Land Use Management Committee
Los Angeles City Council
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, Ca 90012

Re: Proposed Clean Up Green Up Ordinance (Council File 15-1026)

Dear Councilmember Huizar:

This letter is submitted on behalf of a large coalition of regional businesses and business organizations, representing a broad swath of industries that drive the Los Angeles economy. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Clean Up Green Up (CUGU) stakeholder process, however, we have concerns about the CUGU ordinance as proposed. The business community has been contributing to the discussion in drafting this policy since its inception, with little impact.

The original Council motion stated “[T]here is an urgent need for municipal policies that streamline development, attract business and revitalize the local economy while promoting green enterprise and assisting the industrial sector to mitigate environmental impacts and encourage sustainable operational activities.” The proposal does not meet those goals.

We ask:

- That the requirements for a Conditional Use Permit be removed from the proposal or modified.
- That better incentives and support for an ombudsman position be put in place.
- That implementation be delayed until the plan takes into account triggers like an enforcement plan.

Conditional Use Permit (Subdivision 29, Subsection U, of Section 12.24 LAMC)

Some of the more onerous submittals have been removed and the criteria for subject projects modified as they were duplicative of the powers granted to the city by other statutory regulators. However, the requirement for a discretionary approval (i.e. Conditional Use Permit) by the Planning Department for new refineries and existing refineries expanding operations beyond the current property line in M3 zones remains. Oil refineries are currently allowed by-right in M3 Zones. The proposed ordinance requires:

- Current compliance with Unified Programs (CUPA) which monitors hazardous waste, with the California Environmental Reporting System database submittals serving as proof of compliance.
- Submittal of a health impact assessment.
- Submittal of a truck routing plan that minimizes contact with sensitive population areas (schools, hospitals, nursing homes, playgrounds...).

The Coalition believes that overlaying Planning's "approval" and the potential for arbitrary additional requirements is burdensome, unnecessary, and potentially expensive for ALL businesses that are already in compliance with every applicable level of government and especially when the City already has a voice in the CEQA process. As an example, for projects requiring discretionary permits, environmental impacts are evaluated in a CEQA document. The City is provided the draft CEQA documents for review and comment, prior to a final document being issued and the project being approved. The City is already afforded a significant opportunity for affecting the evaluation and reduction of impacts. Thus, any additional review would be duplicative and unnecessarily burdensome. **We recommend that the conditional use permit be removed (proposed Subdivision 29 of Subsection U), or modified to allow the Zoning Administrator as the initial decision-maker (add Subdivision 31 to Subsection X of Section 12.24 LAMC).** The City Planning Commission is appointed as the initial decision-maker in the proposed ordinance.

Unified Programs (CUPA) for Hazardous Materials Review: It isn't clear how the limitations of Subdivision 29 of Subsection U would be enforced relative to the responsibilities of the Los Angeles Fire Department, which serves as the local CUPA, nor is it clear which of the many CUPA programs would be included as part of review by the Planning Department. Local CUPAs administer and enforce multiple environmental and emergency management programs on behalf of several state agencies, and under many statutory provisions. Submittal of a hazardous materials business plan through the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) is not evidence of compliance with CUPA requirements. Reporting through CERS is ministerial only; it does not even provide evidence that a submitted plan is correct, let alone prove that a facility is in compliance with all CUPA requirements across all applicable programs. Compliance can only be shown through regular inspections by the CUPA.

The addition of Subdivision 29 also raises serious implementation questions in relation to CUPA:

- Is the Planning Department merely seeking proof that a submittal occurred on time or would a facility need to submit to the City all data that was reported through CERS?
- What authority does the Planning Department have to determine whether a facility is in compliance with CUPA requirements, and what happens when the City Fire Department disagrees?
- Information reported through CERS is confidential and Cal/EPA has robust and tested protocols in place to protect data and ensure public safety. If the City had access to this data, what safeguards would be put into place to protect the confidentiality and to prevent against disclosure which could facilitate a terrorist attack or other unintended public harm?
- What if a facility was compliant in meeting all reporting requirements but failed a CUPA inspection or had an accidental release?

This section is confusing and appears to conflict with CUPA oversight, and could lead to serious unintended consequences. **For these reasons, we recommend that the CUPA-related limitation be removed from the Conditional Use Permit plan if the CUP must remain.**

Health Impact Assessment as an inappropriate requirement: We are also concerned that a health impact assessment (HIA) would be required for any applicant yet the City has provided limited guidance in terms of scope, process, methodology, or intended purpose. When questioned by CPC and the PLUM committee, staff admitted that they may have confused HIAs with a Health Risk Assessment (HRA). HRAs are occasionally used

under CEQA to quantitatively analyze relationships between a contaminant and a single health outcome. HIAs are usually much broader and utilize qualitative analysis.

HIAs are largely uncharted territory in regards to land use and zoning. They are mainly applied to projects in rural parts of developing nations where no equivalent of CEQA or NEPA exists, and where indirect effects of a project -impact on job creation, for example- can be easily separated out from other casual data. In a qualitative analysis, it would be hard to separate out whether the impact is caused by the proposed project or another unrelated factor. While there have been cases of select projects or policies voluntarily undertaking HIAs, no agency, law, or regulation in California mandates the use of an HIA, and no business or facility that we know of in any of the pilot communities has had direct experience developing an HIA. If health impacts are the goal of analyzing the environmental factors of a project, it is a poor substitute for the quantitative analysis of a HRA that measures impacts and mitigation.

The reliance on qualitative data for findings could result in protracted civil suits to stop projects regardless of impact on area public health. Unlike CEQA, HIAs explicitly have no established methodology or thresholds of significance, many times leaving it to stakeholders to determine what should be analyzed and what is considered an impact. Having no guidelines, methodology, or thresholds of significance established before HIAs are adopted into policy would be tantamount to requiring EIRs without any details of what elements would or should be evaluated. The inclusion of the HIA is just another example of an incomplete policy directive. **We recommend that the Conditional Use Permit be removed, or if the CUP must remain, the HIA requirement should be replaced with a request for a Health Risk Assessment when required by and in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 1401 and "Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401 & 212".**

Environmental Effects and Outcomes

The proposal does little to address pollution in the City. Most of the requirements in the ordinance like fencing and noise are completely unrelated to the "cumulative environmental effects" rationale for the CUGU ordinance. There is no evidence showing that any of the requirements are necessary or have any environmental benefit. Planning staff will not demonstrate exactly how it reduces "cumulative impacts resulting from incompatible land uses" and "improves the impacts resulting from conflicting land uses." They say that will happen after passed, even though a requirement in the original ordinance was to show impact.

It is unreasonable for the Planning Department to suggest that "metrics... are a matter of regulation and are not effectuated in the Zoning Code" (page 12, August staff report) when policies are being put forward that have a significant impact on businesses and have no substantiation that they will reach their goal. The ordinance adds burdensome and unnecessary regulations on legitimate, tax-paying businesses that will increase their costs and in many cases, serve as a deterrent for establishments (established and new) to utilize environmentally friendly opportunities.

We also are concerned about the lack of environmental review of the proposed ordinance's effects. The proposal has moved from a Categorical Exemption to a Negative Declaration, but the impact it will have on the environment throughout the city -positive or negative- is unknown because the City has stated its intention to delay analysis until after the policy takes effect. If businesses necessary to the health of Los Angeles shift away from the pilot areas it could have significant impacts to other areas. The potential impacts should be fully vetted under CEQA. While a Negative Declaration for a proposed ordinance can defer consideration of information that may not be feasibly reviewed at the ordinance level, this tiering approach as per CEQA Guidelines § 15152(b), "does not excuse the lead agency from adequately analyzing reasonably foreseeable significant environmental effects of the project and does not justify deferring such analysis to a later tier". The cursory Negative Declaration presented to the Planning Commission relies on the fact that the ordinance itself

“does not propose any additional development or ground-disturbing activities”, together with the existing built-out nature of the covered neighborhoods, as the basis for concluding that “there will be no foreseeable impact” for each impact category. However, the City cannot simultaneously assert that the impacts of future development projects are sufficiently certain to justify adopting the ordinance in the first place, and yet are too uncertain to consider for CEQA purposes.

The Negative Declaration fails to consider the reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences of diverting impacts of future development to other locations *outside* the Project area. By adding significant new procedural burdens and development standards in the covered neighborhoods only, it is reasonably foreseeable that development will be shifted to other neighborhoods that are not covered. As a result, implementing the ordinance will relocate the same environmental impacts on air and water quality from industrial land use and transportation-related emissions, that the ordinance seeks to address, to new areas. New areas of relocated development may be less built-out than the neighborhoods covered by the ordinance, and may include sensitive receptors and land uses. Relocating development may also increase total vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) and vehicle emissions, by moving jobs further from the workers’ residences. Even though the ordinance is intended to be environmentally beneficial for the covered areas, it is well-settled that adverse environmental side-effects of such beneficial programs must be studied under CEQA prior to adoption.

It is likely that achieving the environmental benefits of the ordinance will not be possible without accepting some unavoidable shifting of environmental burdens to other neighborhoods, with impacts on new sensitive receptors and increased VMT. While the City has the discretion to balance such benefits and burdens, CEQA does not allow it to do so in a Negative Declaration. Rather, the City must perform a full Environmental Impact Report to evaluate significant and unavoidable impacts, and must adopt a statement of overriding considerations.

We recommend that the City conduct a full Environmental Impact Review to vet the ordinance.

While DCP has no authority to include a retroactive enforcement strategy on existing businesses that do not abide by rules and regulations, LADBS does have the ability to expand the Annual Inspection and Monitoring program. LADBS after we raised the issue chose to expand the monitoring program, even though the August staff report stated that many of the businesses it monitors like auto dismantling yards contribute to cumulative impacts when located in close proximity to one another and to Publicly Habitable Space (pages 112-3, August CUGU staff report). However, the City doesn’t have the means to enforce effectively its current policy; how can it be expected to enforce new policy under CUGU?

The proposal also penalizes businesses that may have environmentally friendly practices from operating. For example, smog test stations will not be able to expand or open new businesses within 500 feet of a residential area in the pilot areas, with other restrictions put on any smog test station’s property. A smog station’s main purpose is to improve air quality in the City.

We recommend that the City delay implementation of the ordinance until July 1, 2016, until a dedicated enforcement plan with funding is in place that targets those violating CUGU policy, as well as unpermitted and potentially illegally operating businesses of any type with known environmental and public health impacts, with the aim to bring these businesses into compliance. If no plan is in place by July 1, 2016, the implementation should be delayed until one exists.

Ombudsman and Incentives

This ordinance falls short of the original intent of the CUGU initiative by neglecting incentivize, educate, motivate, and assist business owners toward more environmentally healthy practices as the policy has been sold to communities. An ombudsman position has been added for FY 2015-16 as an Environmental Affairs Officer, funded out of the Bureau of Sanitation's budget, but to the best of our knowledge, that position has not been filled while we approach the end of the fiscal year. It is also important to note that while Clean Up Green Up if passed would live on in perpetuity, the ombudsman position is funded on a yearly basis with no guarantees that the position would continue on from year to year, or that their duties would stay dedicated toward matching businesses to Clean Up Green Up-focused incentives. **We recommend that the City delay implementation until July 1, 2016 of the ordinance until the ombudsman is set in place. If no structure and budget is in place by July 1, the implementation should be delayed until one exists.**

Furthermore, no new incentives are being offered apart from ones already available from regulatory agencies and utilities. Repeatedly, members of the public have offered public comment in support of Clean Up Green Up based on the idea sold to them that area businesses will receive assistance by way of incentives. Community groups in the pilot areas have shared information about existing incentives with area business already. The City can and should do more to incentive participation in Clean Up Green Up's program. **We also recommend that the City should delay implementation until July 1, 2016 of the ordinance until an incentive plan can be arranged and funded. If no incentive plan is in place by July 1, the implementation should be delayed until one exists.**

Some ideas for incentives could include:


- Microloan or Business Expansion Program - A partnership with local banks, and the City of Los Angeles, to provide loans to qualifying small businesses in the three target CUGU communities. The program would make loans available up to (specify an amount, e.g., \$50,000), for businesses with annual gross revenues of less than (specify an amount, e.g., \$1 or 2 million), and may not qualify for traditional financing.
- Property Tax Exemptions for Pollution Control Property - Property that is installed (or is being installed) wholly or partly for pollution control purposes would be eligible for determination purposes (e.g., baghouse, scrubber). Land would also be eligible for determination purposes, but only if acquired after the approval date of the CUGU ordinance. Examples could be 1) property that is purchased or set aside and used solely for pollution control, and 2) property acquired and used as a Buffer Zone.
- Fee Holiday – Businesses, especially small businesses, would be eligible for a one-year waiver of permit fees if they demonstrate a record of violation-free operation for a period of years.
- Discounts for Continuing Education and Certification – Working in concert with Los Angeles Community College/Los Angeles Trade Technical College, the City of Los Angeles could offer small businesses, and their eligible employees, access to education, training and certification (or certificate of completion) in such coursework as carpentry, electronics, computer-aided drafting/design, CNC machine, materials handling, and more, at discounted prices. The training would them more competitive in the local workplace.

In summary, within the proposed ordinance there is no plan or budget for enforcement of unlawfully operating businesses; no plan for measuring cost/benefit or metrics for success; no structure or budget for the ombudsperson; no incentive plan for legally operating businesses; and arbitrary and burdensome mandates that create a disadvantage to CUGU participants including requirements for a Conditional Use Permit that relies on undefined Health Impact Assessments and CUPA participation. For the reasons outlined in this letter, we

respectfully urge you to change the Clean Up Green Up ordinance as recommended. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Alycia Witzling, Public Policy Manager for the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce at (213) 580-7531 or awitzling@lachamber.com.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,



Gary Toebben
President & CEO
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce



Gerald M. Bonetto, Ph.D.
Vice President of Government Affairs
Printing Industries of California



Dan Hoffman
Executive Director
Wilmington Chamber of Commerce



Bill LaMarr
Executive Director
California Small Business Alliance



Michael W. Lewis
Senior Vice President
Construction Industry Air Quality Coalition



Jim Clarke
Executive Vice President
Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles



Tracy Rafter
Founding CEO
Los Angeles County Business Federation



Patty Senecal
Manager, Southern California Region and
Infrastructure Issues
Western States Petroleum Association



Stuart Waldman
President
Valley Industry and Commerce Association



Elizabeth Warren
Executive Director
FuturePorts



Weston LaBar
Executive Director
Harbor Trucking Association



Carol Schatz
President & CEO
Central City Association



Russell Snyder
Executive Director
California Asphalt Pavement Association



David R. McClune
Executive Director
California Autobody Association



Gary Stafford
Chair, Environmental Affairs
California Furniture Manufacturers Association



Tim Piasky
Chief Executive Officer
Building Industry Association – LA/Ventura Chapter



Nancy Hoffman Vanyek
Chief Executive Officer
Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce



Michael Jackson
Immediate Past Chair
South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce



Kirk Marckwald

California Class 1 Railroads

CC: Councilmember Gil Cedillo
Councilmember Felipe Fuentes
Mayor Eric Garcetti
Vince Bertoni, Dept. of City Planning
Kevin Keller, Office of the Mayor

Councilmember Mitch Englander
Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson
Councilmember Joe Buscaino
Hagu Solomon-Cary, Dept. of City Planning