

BLUM | COLLINS LLP

Aon Center
707 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 4880
Los Angeles, California
90017

213.572.0400 phone
213.572.0401 fax

September 6, 2016

PLUM Committee
City of Los Angeles
c/o Etta Armstrong, Assistant to Sharon Dickinson
etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Via Email

Re: *California Environmental Quality Act Comments on Paramount Pictures Master Plan FEIR, City Case No. ENV-2011-2460-EIR; State Clearinghouse No. 2011101035*

Dear Ms. Armstrong and Ms. Dickinson and the Planning and Land Use Management Committee of the City of Los Angeles:

Please accept these further comments pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) on behalf of the SoCal Environmental Justice Alliance on the Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) for the Paramount Pictures Master Plan project (“the Project”) which you are considering today. They should be considered by the Committee and should become a part of the Administrative Record.

We only found out this morning that the matter would be heard today, and so we rushed to put together these comments. As recently as August 30, I asked Sharon Dickinson when the matter would be considered by the PLUM Committee and she said that she didn’t know. Apparently, the next day it was scheduled for September 6, 2016, and no one notified us.

We ask that the matter be continued so that we have more time to review and comment on the EIR, particularly the air quality component.

Air Quality

We have reviewed the Air Quality section of the DEIR further and had the following to say. First, the DEIR says the assumptions for its conclusions regarding construction and operational emissions are in the Appendices, specifically Appendix E.1. We have reviewed those Appendices and find them not to clearly elucidate what those assumptions are, and at any rate the assumptions should be in the DEIR itself. *See Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth v. City of Rancho Cordova* (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 412.

With respect to the DEIR at D.IV.B.1-4, under *Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield* (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, you should include the health impacts of the different air pollutants causing significant impacts. We don't think you have adequately addressed the significant impacts from ozone as you have not acknowledged an increased mortality risk and the fact that children who live in high ozone communities and participate in multiple sports have been observed to have a higher asthma risk.

At D.IV.B.1-7 you state that Diesel Particulate Matter ("DPM") "may be a health hazard." This is an understatement. It is a known carcinogen and cause of acute health effects.

At D.IV.B.1-8 you indicate that federal nonattainment is categorized under seven levels but you do not expressly acknowledge that we are at the worst level, extreme nonattainment, for ozone, which means that it will take more than 17 years for the region to reach attainment. Since the Project is a causative factor in our not achieving attainment, this is a significant omission.

At D.IV.B.1-49 you indicate that the Project plans to use backup diesel powered emergency generators, but you do not model their impacts. We think you should have conducted a Health Risk Assessment as to the operation of the Project based on an assumed level of use for the generators.

You nowhere, to our knowledge, indicate how long the Project will be under construction, but at D.IV.B.1-50 you indicate that the Project's concurrent construction and operational emissions in 2033 will exceed regional thresholds for VOC and NO_x.¹ The DEIR should disclose how long construction will be going on and it was entirely proper to do a Health Risk Assessment under these circumstances.

At D.IV.B.1-52 you indicate that because the Project will not involve any substantial stationary source emissions, the proper benchmark is CO emissions. We disagree with this conclusion as vehicles including diesel trucks can have significant NO_x and PM emissions. We're not sure you assessed whether the Project would lead to an exceedance of an air quality standard with respect to NO_x, as you there only address localized emissions.

We also disagree with your conclusion that the Project is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan, as the 188,433 jobs projected in the 2008 RTP should be further broken down by sub-sub-regions. And you should have assessed the more recent 2012 AQMP against the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we reviewed your Appendix E.1 and it does not fully disclose the basis for your assumptions and to the extent it does it appears flawed.

¹ The Appendices, or at least Appendix E.1, do not disclose that construction will be going on for this long, as it appears construction will occur for a maximum of seven years.

Etta Armstrong, Sharon Dickinson and
Los Angeles City PLUM Committee
September 6, 2016
Page 3

Specifically, the Appendix appears to group out a series of sub-projects into groups A-D, and even though it acknowledges that those sub-projects will be constructed concurrently, it does not assess the air quality impacts for those sub-projects concurrently. Rather, it picks out the maximum daily emissions for a given year for each sub-group in order to identify when emissions would be significant. We think this substantially understates the emissions that will occur.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

/s/ Craig M. Collins

Craig M. Collins
Blum Collins LLP