

Communication from Public

Name: Chris Chavez

Date Submitted: 09/24/2025 02:36 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S85

Comments for Public Posting: September 23, 2025 The Honorable Marqueece Harris-Dawson President, Los Angeles City Council 200 N. Spring St., Room 450 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Dear Council President Harris-Dawson, We are writing to express our opposition to File Item 25-0002-S85, relating to Senate Bill 34 (Richardson). SB 34 would constrain the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (South Coast AQMD) efforts to reduce emissions from the region's single largest source of NOx emissions in the smoggiest air basin in the country: the ports and port-related activities. Such constraints are unacceptable considering Los Angeles's air quality challenges. The air in Southern California is so bad that we persistently fail to meet both national and state air quality standards. According to South Coast AQMD, over 1,500 Southern Californians die prematurely every year due to our inability to meet clean air standards. Yet, both SB 34 and File Item 25-0002-S85 advance the false narrative that health-protective rulemaking is the problem rather than pollution. SB 34 would also undermine decades of work by community, environmental, environmental justice and public health advocates. Community members and advocates have consistently engaged in the rulemaking process, having participated in countless public working groups, community listening sessions and meetings with staff and board members as well as submitting both written comments and verbal testimony at public hearings. SB 34 ignores all of this and would impose restrictions from Sacramento rather than addressing the lived experience of portside residents. Finally, we would like to note that we oppose the new "cooperative agreement" initiated by the ports and South Coast AQMD in mid-July to early-August. Not only has this short circuited the years-long public rulemaking process over the last two months, but the current proposal goes beyond what SB 34 proposes in terms of restrictions on South Coast AQMD. We also wish to state that our objections to SB 34 and File Item 25-0002-S85 are not related to human-operated equipment. 2025 has proven to be a particularly challenging year for public health, environmental protection and environmental justice. We need strong state and local environmental and environmental justice leadership now more than ever. SB 34, however, would move Los Angeles in the wrong direction, at the expense of some of California's most

vulnerable, environmentally burdened communities. Thank you
for your consideration of our comments. Sincerely, Chris Chavez
Deputy Policy Director Coalition for Clean Air Taylor Thomas
Research & Policy Analyst/Co-Executive Director East Yard
Communities for Environmental Justice Jennifer Cardenas
Organizer, Clean Transportation for All Campaign Sierra Club
Theral Golden West Long Beach Association Eli Lipman
Executive Director Move LA



September 23, 2025

The Honorable Marqueece Harris-Dawson

President, Los Angeles City Council
200 N. Spring St., Room 450
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Council President Harris-Dawson,

We are writing to express our opposition to File Item 25-0002-S85, relating to Senate Bill 34 (Richardson). SB 34 would constrain the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (South Coast AQMD) efforts to reduce emissions from the region's single largest source of NOx emissions in the smoggiest air basin in the country: the ports and port-related activities.

Such constraints are unacceptable considering Los Angeles's air quality challenges. The air in Southern California is so bad that we persistently fail to meet both national and state air quality standards. According to South Coast AQMD, over 1,500 Southern Californians die prematurely every year due to our inability to meet clean air standards. Yet, both SB 34 and File Item 25-0002-S85 advance the false narrative that health-protective rulemaking is the problem rather than pollution.

SB 34 would also undermine decades of work by community, environmental, environmental justice and public health advocates. Community members and advocates have consistently engaged in the rulemaking process, having participated in countless public working groups, community listening sessions and meetings with staff and board members as well as submitting both written comments and verbal testimony at public hearings. SB 34 ignores all of this and would impose restrictions from Sacramento rather than addressing the lived experience of portside residents.

Finally, we would like to note that we oppose the new "cooperative agreement" initiated by the ports and South Coast AQMD in mid-July to early-August. Not only has this short circuited the years-long public rulemaking process over the last two months, but the current proposal goes beyond what SB 34 proposes in terms of restrictions on South

Coast AQMD. We also wish to state that our objections to SB 34 and File Item 25-0002-S85 are not related to human-operated equipment.

2025 has proven to be a particularly challenging year for public health, environmental protection and environmental justice. We need strong state and local environmental and environmental justice leadership now more than ever. SB 34, however, would move Los Angeles in the wrong direction, at the expense of some of California's most vulnerable, environmentally burdened communities.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Chris Chavez
Deputy Policy Director
Coalition for Clean Air

Taylor Thomas
Research & Policy Analyst/Co-Executive Director
East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice

Jennifer Cardenas
Organizer, Clean Transportation for All Campaign
Sierra Club

Theral Golden
West Long Beach Association

Eli Lipman
Executive Director
Move LA