

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 U.S. MAIL & E-MAIL

May 27, 2021

Candance Assadzadeh, Senior Planner
City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Dept.
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522
Em: cassadzadeh@riversideca.gov

Frances Andrade
City of Riverside Planning Commission
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522
Em: fandrade@riversideca.gov

RE: Crestview Apartments Project

Dear Ms. Assadzadeh and Mr. Andrade,

On behalf of the **Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters** (“**Commenter**” or “**Carpenter**”), my Office is submitting these comments on the City of Riverside’s (“**City**” or “**Lead Agency**”) Draft Environmental Impact Report (“**DEIR**”) (SCH No. 2020069047) for the Crestview Apartments Project, a new residential development proposed for 237 residential units and supporting uses (“**Project**”).

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

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

Commenters 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.

Commenters 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.

Commenters incorporates by reference all comments raising issues regarding the 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 Applicant 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. 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

The City should also require the Project to be built to standards exceeding the current 2019 California Green Building Code to mitigate the Project’s environmental impacts and to advance progress towards the State of California’s environmental goals.

This letter is intended to supplement Commenter’s May 3, 2021 comment letter concerning the Project.

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>

I. **THE PLANNING COMMISSION SHOULD CONTINUE THIS ITEM TO CONSIDER THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

The City is currently recommending that the Planning Commission recommend approval of this Project and certification of the environmental impact report without even considering or reviewing the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project.

The City’s approach violates the California Environmental Quality Act, Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21100 *et seq* (“**CEQA**”) and the City’s municipal code. CEQA requires that a lead agency certify a Final Environmental Impact Report (“**Final EIR**”) that includes responses to any comments submitted to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“**Draft EIR**”) as well as changes, in any, made to the Final EIR from the previous draft. CEQA Guidelines § 15090.

The Municipal Code requires that the Planning Commission “[r]eview and approve environmental documents prepared pursuant to [CEQA]” Riverside Municipal Code § 19.050.030(B)(9). Since the City must ultimately certify a Final Environmental Impact Report, and since the Project’s Environmental Impact Report is currently in mere draft form, the Planning Commission would be abandoning its duties to review and approve the Project’s Environmental Impact Report if it were to pass this Project on to the City Council having only reviewed the a mere draft of the Project’s EIR.

III. CONCLUSION

Commenters request that the City revise and recirculate the Project’s environmental impact report to address the aforementioned concerns. 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