



P: (626) 381-9248  
F: (626) 389-5414  
E: [info@mitschtsailaw.com](mailto:info@mitschtsailaw.com)

**Mitchell M. Tsai**  
Attorney At Law

155 South El Molino Avenue  
Suite 104  
Pasadena, California 91101

---

**VIA E-MAIL**

July 9, 2021

Alan Como  
221 N. Figueroa St., Room 1350  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Email: [Alan.Como@lacity.org](mailto:Alan.Como@lacity.org)

RE: Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment for the Crenshaw Crossing Project (SCH No. 2021060246)

Dear Mr. Como,

On behalf of the **Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters** (“**Commenter**” or “**Southwest Carpenters**”), my Office is submitting these comments on the City of Los Angeles (“**City**” or “**Lead Agency**”) Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (“**SCEA**”) for the Crenshaw Crossing Project (SCH No. 2021060246) (“**Project**”).

The Southwest Carpenters is a labor union representing more than 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 Carpenters 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 SCEA 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 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.<sup>1</sup>

Recently, on May 7, 2021, the South Coast Air Quality Management District found that that the “[u]se of a local state-certified apprenticeship program or a skilled and trained workforce with a local hire component” can result in air pollutant reductions.<sup>2</sup>

Cities are increasingly adopting local skilled and trained workforce policies and requirements into general plans and municipal codes. For example, the City of Hayward 2040 General Plan requires the City to “promote local hiring . . . to help achieve a more positive jobs-housing balance, and reduce regional commuting, gas consumption, and greenhouse gas emissions.”<sup>3</sup>

In fact, the City of Hayward has gone as far as to adopt a Skilled Labor Force policy into its Downtown Specific Plan and municipal code, requiring developments in its Downtown area to requiring that the City “[c]ontribute to the stabilization of regional construction markets by spurring applicants of housing and nonresidential developments to require contractors to utilize apprentices from state-approved, joint

---

<sup>1</sup> 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>

<sup>2</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District (May 7, 2021) Certify Final Environmental Assessment and Adopt Proposed Rule 2305 – Warehouse Indirect Source Rule – Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce Emissions Program, and Proposed Rule 316 – Fees for Rule 2305, Submit Rule 2305 for Inclusion Into the SIP, and Approve Supporting Budget Actions, *available at* <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/Agendas/Governing-Board/2021/2021-May7-027.pdf?sfvrsn=10>

<sup>3</sup> City of Hayward (2014) Hayward 2040 General Plan Policy Document at p. 3-99, *available at* [https://www.hayward-ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/General\\_Plan\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.hayward-ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/General_Plan_FINAL.pdf).

labor-management training programs, . . .”<sup>4</sup> In addition, the City of Hayward requires all projects 30,000 square feet or larger to “utilize apprentices from state-approved, joint labor-management training programs.”<sup>5</sup>

Locating jobs closer to residential areas can have significant environmental benefits. As the California Planning Roundtable noted in 2008:

People who live and work in the same jurisdiction would be more likely to take transit, walk, or bicycle to work than residents of less balanced communities and their vehicle trips would be shorter. Benefits would include potential reductions in both vehicle miles traveled and vehicle hours traveled.<sup>6</sup>

In addition, local hire mandates as well as skill training are critical facets of a strategy to reduce vehicle miles traveled. As planning experts Robert Cervero and Michael Duncan noted, simply placing jobs near housing stock is insufficient to achieve VMT reductions since the skill requirements of available local jobs must be matched to those held by local residents.<sup>7</sup> Some municipalities have tied local hire and skilled and trained workforce policies to local development permits to address transportation issues. As Cervero and Duncan note:

In nearly built-out Berkeley, CA, the approach to balancing jobs and housing is to create local jobs rather than to develop new housing.” The city’s First Source program encourages businesses to hire local residents, especially for entry- and intermediate-level jobs, and sponsors vocational training to ensure residents are employment-ready. While the program is voluntary, some 300 businesses have used it to date, placing more than 3,000 city residents in local jobs since it was launched in 1986. When

---

<sup>4</sup> City of Hayward (2019) Hayward Downtown Specific Plan at p. 5-24, *available at* <https://www.hayward-ca.gov/sites/default/files/Hayward%20Downtown%20Specific%20Plan.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> City of Hayward Municipal Code, Chapter 10, § 28.5.3.020(C).

<sup>6</sup> California Planning Roundtable (2008) Deconstructing Jobs-Housing Balance at p. 6, *available at* <https://cproundtable.org/static/media/uploads/publications/cpr-jobs-housing.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Cervero, Robert and Duncan, Michael (2006) Which Reduces Vehicle Travel More: Jobs-Housing Balance or Retail-Housing Mixing? *Journal of the American Planning Association* 72 (4), 475-490, 482, *available at* <http://reconnectingamerica.org/assets/Uploads/UTCT-825.pdf>.

needed, these carrots are matched by sticks, since the city is not shy about negotiating corporate participation in First Source as a condition of approval for development permits.

The City should consider utilizing skilled and trained workforce policies and requirements to benefit the local area economically and mitigate greenhouse gas, air quality and transportation impacts.

Also, the City should require the Project to be built 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).<sup>8</sup> “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 “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*

---

<sup>8</sup> 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.

*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. Background Concerning Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessments

SB 375 provides CEQA-based incentives and streamlining for certain residential, mixed-use, and transportation-oriented developments. SB 375 includes two optional CEQA streamlining options for local lead agencies.

First, under SB 375, residential and mixed-use projects that (1) are consistent with the use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified in a California Air Resources Board (“CARB”)-approved sustainable communities strategy (“SCS”) or alternative planning strategy (“APS”) and (2) incorporate mitigation measures required by an “applicable prior environmental document,” which may include the environmental impact report for the regional transportation plan, need not reference, describe or discuss growth-inducing impacts or project-specific or cumulative impacts on global warming or on the regional transportation network arising from automobiles or light-duty truck trips generated by the Project. PRC §21159.28(a).

Second, TPPs consistent with the SCS or APS may qualify for a total CEQA exemption or a Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (“SCEA”). PRC §21155.1-21155.2. A TPP is a specific project that must (1) be consistent with a CARB-approved SCS or APS; (2) contain at least 50 percent residential use, and if the project contains between 26 percent and 50 percent nonresidential uses, then a floor area ratio of not less than 0.75, (3) have a minimum net density of 20 units per acre; and (4) be located within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor included in a regional transportation plan. PRC §21155.

A TPP may be reviewed through a SCEA provided, *inter alia*, that (1) an initial study identifies “all significant or potentially significant impacts of the transit priority project... based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record” PRC §21155.2(b)(1); (2) the SCEA shall contain “measures that either avoid or mitigate to a level of insignificance all potentially significant or significant effects of the project required to be identified in the initial study” PRC §21155.2(b)(2); and (3) “the lead agency's decision to review and approve a transit priority project with a sustainable communities environmental assessment” is “reviewed under the substantial evidence standard” PRC §21155.2(b)(7).

A SCEA is similar to a negative declaration in that the lead agency must identify and

analyze all potentially significant or significant effects of the project and mitigate them to a level of less than significant. See PRC §21155.2(b).

If a legislative body of a city or county finds, after conducting a public hearing, that a transit priority project meets all of the requirements subdivisions (a) and (b) and one of the requirements of subdivision (c) of PRC § 21155.1, the TPP is declared to be a sustainable communities project and will be exempt from CEQA. PRC § 21155.1. At a minimum, the legislative body of a city or county must find that the project can be adequately served by existing utilities and that:

- (1) the project site does not contain wetlands or riparian areas or have significant value as wildlife habitat,
- (2) the project does not have a significant effect on historical resources,
- (3) the project buildings are energy efficient,
- (4) landscaping is designed to achieve 25 percent less water usage, and
- (5) the project does not present a risk of public health exposure in violation of state or federal law.

PRC § 21155.1.

A SCEA may be approved by the lead agency after conducting a public hearing, reviewing the comments received, and finding that: (A) all potentially significant or significant effects required to be identified in the initial study have been identified and analyzed, (B) with respect to each significant effect on the environment required to be identified in the initial study, either of the following apply: (i) changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project that avoid or mitigate the significant effects to a level of insignificance, and (ii) those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency. PRC §21155.2(b)(5).

The lead agency's decision to review and approve a TPP with a SCEA shall be reviewed under the substantial evidence standard. PRC §21155.2(b)(7).



C. 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 Occupations Safety and Health Administration. Recently, several construction sites have been identified as sources of community spread of COVID-19.<sup>9</sup>

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:

**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.

---

<sup>9</sup> 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>.

- 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.<sup>10</sup>

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 has also developed a rigorous Infection Control Risk Assessment (“**ICRA**”) training program to ensure it delivers a workforce that understands how to identify and

---

<sup>10</sup> 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](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](https://dpw.lacounty.gov/building-and-safety/docs/pw_guidelines-construction-sites.pdf).

control infection risks by implementing protocols to protect themselves and all others during renovation and construction projects in healthcare environments.<sup>11</sup>

ICRA protocols are intended to contain pathogens, control airflow, and protect patients during the construction, maintenance and renovation of healthcare facilities. ICRA protocols prevent cross contamination, minimizing the risk of secondary infections in patients at hospital facilities.

The City should require the Project to be built using a workforce trained in ICRA protocols.

## II. **THE PROJECT SCEA IS INADEQUATE**

- A. The Project Cannot be Evaluated Under a SCEA since the SCEA Does Not Evaluate the Project’s Consistency with the General Use Designation, Density, Building Intensity and Applicable Policies specified for the Project Area in SCAG’s 2020 – 2045 RTP / SCS

Despite the fact that the Air Resources Board approved SCAG’s 2020 – 2045 RTP / SCS titled “Connect SoCal” in October of last year,<sup>12</sup> the Project’s SCEA claims that the Project qualifies to be evaluated under a SCEA since it is “consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in the SCAG **2016 – 2040 RTP / SCS**. SCEA at 1.0-2.

Section 21155 of the Cal. Public Resources Code does not state a project must be consistent with the 20160 – 2040 RTP / SCS, rather it requires that a project be “consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy, for which the State Air Resources Board, . . . , has accepted.” Since the most recent version of the SCAG’s RTP / SCS approved by the Air Resources Board is the 2020 – 2045 RTP / SCS, the SCEA is required to evaluate consistency with the 2020 plan rather than the long outdated 2016 plan

---

<sup>11</sup> For details concerning SWRCC’s ICRA training program, see <https://icrahealthcare.com/>.

<sup>12</sup> California Air Resources Board (Oct. 30, 2020) Executive Order G-20-239, available at <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2021-02/SCAG%202020%20SCS%20CARB%20Acceptance%20of%20GHG%20Quantification%20Determination%20Executive%20Order.pdf>

B. The SCEA Adopts an Improper Environmental Baseline by Failing to Evaluate Existing Conditions at the Project Site

The SCEA improperly excludes the fact that currently the County is utilizing the Project Site as an interim housing for homeless families, families that would be removed if the Project was to be approved from the environmental baseline for the Project. SCEA at 2.0-6. “Generally, the lead agency should describe physical environmental conditions as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced . . . .” CEQA Guidelines § 15125(a).

While the SCEA speculates that this use is temporary, and claims that removal of this facility for homeless families is inevitable (a disturbing conclusion), CEQA does not allow such speculation on future uses. CEQA simply requires that the City analyze current existing conditions at the time of environmental analysis. Excluding the “interim” use of the Project Site for homeless housing violates CEQA.

C. The Project Cannot be Evaluated Under a SCEA since the SCEA Fails to Incorporate all Feasible Mitigation Measures from Prior Environmental Impact Reports

Section 21155.2 of the Cal. Public Resources Code requires that a Transit Priority Project incorporate all feasible mitigation measures, performance standards, or criteria from prior applicable environmental impact reports. However, the Project’s EIR expressly rejects many, if not most of the applicable mitigation measures identified in SCAG’s 2020 – 2045 RTP / SCS EIR without making a feasibility determination. EIR at 3.1-14 – 20.


For example, the EIR claims that items a through p of PMM AQ-1 need to be integrated into the Project because the Project would substantially implement the application portions of these items under existing regulatory requirements. However, not only do existing regulatory requirements not require many of the mitigation measures, for example the use of Tier 4 Final, the EIR fails to provide a reason why implementation of items a through p of PMM AQ-1 would not be feasible.

In addition, the EIR unlawfully fails to incorporate feasible mitigation measures simply on the basis that the SCEA did not identify a potentially significant impact. *See. e.g.* SCEA at 3.0 – 36. Section 21155.2 subd. (a) is unambiguous in stating that transit priority projects must incorporate “**all feasible mitigation measures**, performance

standards or criteria set forth in prior environmental impact reports,” irrespective of whether the SCEA finds a less than significant impact with mitigation. The Project is required to incorporate all feasible mitigation measures, regardless of whether the SCEA identifies a potentially significant impact.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mitchell M. Tsai", written over a horizontal line.

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).