

**Air Pollution Control District Governing Board**  
San Diego County Air Pollution Control District  
**AGENDA ITEM # 04**

**DATE:** November 4, 2021

**TO:** Air Pollution Control District Governing Board

**SUBJECT:**

ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO RULE 1210 (TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS-PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION)

**REQUESTED ACTION:**

1. Find that an Environmental Review of proposed amended Rule 1210 – Toxic Air Contaminant Public Health Risks-Public Notification and Risk Reduction has been completed in accordance with Section 15187 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and that these proposed amendments are exempt from CEQA under Sections 15330, 15301 and Section 15061 subsection (b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.
  
2. Adopt the Resolution entitled: RESOLUTION ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO RULE 1210 – TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS-PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION, OF REGULATION XII OF THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

**OVERVIEW:**

Rule 1210 was adopted in 1996 in response to the California Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act (Hot Spots Act), Assembly Bill 2588, which requires local air pollution control districts to evaluate toxic air contaminant emissions from various stationary sources and determine which sources generate emissions that may present public health concerns.

Rule 1210 establishes thresholds and procedures for public notification and risk reduction requirements. Currently, Rule 1210 requires those facilities with significant cancer risks equal to or greater than 100 in one million to reduce those risks within five years. The cancer risk represents the probability that a person might develop cancer due to exposure to the facility's emissions. Rule 1210 also requires facilities to provide public notification to all persons in the affected area when the facility-wide cancer risk is equal to or greater than 10 in one million. The existing Rule 1210 cancer risk reduction threshold of 100 in one million is ineffective since there are no facilities in San Diego County that create a cancer risk above that threshold, and it does not align with the public notification threshold of 10 in one million.

On May 22, 2019, the former San Diego County Air Pollution Control Board directed the Air Pollution Control District (District) to evaluate the cancer risk reduction threshold. After conducting extensive evaluation and considering input from stakeholders, the District is proposing the following amendments to improve public health by reducing the cancer health risk in San

**SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO RULE 1210 (TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS-PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION)**

Diego County: (1) lower the significant risk threshold for cancer from 100 in one million to 10 in one million; (2) enhance the public notification protocols and public meeting requirements; and (3) consider providing additional time for facilities where it is not feasible to reduce health risks within a 5-year timeframe. The District must consider additional time for some industries because control technology may not be currently available and is still advancing. The proposed amendments include a provision for a 3-year extension to reduce the cancer risk to below the proposed cancer risk reduction threshold. The extension may be granted provided that the facility has installed Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT) within the 5-year timeframe. The proposed amendments also provide the potential for additional 3-year extensions provided all technically feasible control measures have been implemented.

The proposed amendments to Rule 1210 are necessary to further protect public health from toxic air contaminants by establishing a health protective threshold, requiring progress toward that threshold to the greatest extent feasible, and aligning the risk reduction and public notification thresholds.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact on the District to implement these these recommendations.

**PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND OUTREACH:**

The District released proposed amendments for Rule 1210 on July 8, 2021, and conducted a public workshop on August 5, 2021 to gather input on the proposed amended rule from members of the public, regulated community and other stakeholders. A workshop notice was posted on the District's website and sent by U.S. mail to approximately 3,500 recipients including each air quality permit holder and chamber of commerce in the region. Workshop notices were also sent to over 14,000 subscribers to the District's email notification service, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board.

The workshop was attended by 32 people, including members of the public, representatives from businesses, government agencies, the Navy, and local industrial and environmental organizations. Spanish interpretation services were provided during the public workshop, which is also available on the District's YouTube Channel. The District received 12 comment letters after the public workshop and responded to stakeholder comments in the resulting Workshop Report (Attachment E). If the rule amendments are adopted, staff will conduct additional outreach including the distribution of an advisory notice to further inform potentially affected parties.

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT:**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires environmental review of actions by public agencies that could affect the environment, unless an exemption applies. In addition, a special rule at Section 15187 of the CEQA Guidelines requires certain regulatory agencies, including air pollution control districts, to conduct an environmental review of actions they take that may require the use of pollution control measures. The District has conducted that review (Attachment D), which includes an evaluation of the potential cumulative impacts of possible compliance actions that sources may choose to take in response to this action. Based on that

**SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO RULE 1210 (TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS-PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION)**

review, District staff have concluded that three Categorical Exemptions in the CEQA Guidelines are applicable to this action. The action is exempt from CEQA under Section 15330 of the CEQA Guidelines because at sources where control measures could generate a waste side stream, only minor actions would be required to mitigate the release of hazardous substances or wastes, and other regulatory programs already require those actions. The action is also exempt under Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines because only minor alterations would be made to existing facilities to comply with the rule changes, and it is exempt under Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA guidelines because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment.

**PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOARD ACTIONS:**

July 8, 2020 (AP04), Discussion of Amendments to Rule 1210 – Toxic Air Contaminant Public Health Risks-Public Notification and Risk Reduction

May 22, 2019 (AP01), Reducing Cancer Risk for San Diego County Residents

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

Attachment A – Resolution Adopting Amendments to Rule 1210 – Toxic Air Contaminant Public Health Risks-Public Notification and Risk Reduction, of Regulation XII of the Rules and Regulations of the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District

Attachment B – Background

Attachment C – Socioeconomic Impact Assessment

Attachment D – Environmental Review

Attachment E – Workshop Report

Attachment F – Rule 1210 Change Copy

**SUBMITTED BY:**

Paula Forbis, Interim Air Pollution Control Officer

**CONTACT PERSON(S):**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Name</b>
Michael Watt, Deputy Director	Mahiany Luther, Deputy Director
<b>Phone</b>	<b>Phone</b>
(858) 899-0136	(858) 692-9910
<b>Email</b>	<b>Email</b>
Michael.Watt@sdcounty.ca.gov	Mahiany.Luther@sdcounty.ca.gov

Resolution No: 21-008  
Meeting Date: 11/4/2021

**RESOLUTION ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO RULE 1210 – TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS-PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION, OF REGULATION XII OF THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT**

On motion of Member Fletcher, seconded by Member Vargas, the following resolution is adopted:

**WHEREAS**, the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Board, pursuant to Section 40702 of the California Health and Safety Code, adopted Rules and Regulations of the Air Pollution Control District of San Diego County; and

**WHEREAS**, the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Governing Board (Governing Board) now desires to amend said Rules and Regulations; and

**WHEREAS**, notice has been given and a public hearing has been held relating to the amendment of said Rules and Regulations pursuant to Section 40725 of the California Health and Safety Code; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Section 40727 of the California Health and Safety Code, the Governing Board makes the following findings:

- (1) (Necessity) The adoption of proposed amended Rule 1210 is necessary to reduce exposures to controllable emissions of toxic air contaminants from a small number of sources, where risk assessment has shown that the health risks from such exposures would be undue and disproportionate;
- (2) (Authority) The adoption of proposed amended Rule 1210 is authorized by Section 40702 of the California Health and Safety Code;
- (3) (Clarity) Proposed amended Rule 1210 can be understood by persons directly affected by them;
- (4) (Consistency) The adoption of proposed amended Rule 1210 is in harmony with, and not in conflict with or contrary to, existing statutes, court decisions, and State and federal regulations;
- (5) (Non-duplication) The adoption of proposed amended Rule 1210 will not duplicate existing District, State, or federal requirements;

- (6) (Reference) The adoption of proposed amended Rule 1210 contains specific requirements and procedures for notifying exposed persons regarding the results of health risk assessments which indicate a significant health risk associated with toxic air contaminant emissions from a facility, and for conducting an air toxic risk reduction audit and developing and implementing a plan of air toxic risk reduction measures, as required by Sections 44362 and 44391 of the California Health and Safety Code;

**WHEREAS**, the Governing Board further finds that a written analysis comparing proposed amended Rule 1210 with applicable requirements of federal and local regulations is not required pursuant to Section 40727.2 of the California Health and Safety Code because the proposed amendments do not impose a new emission limit or standard, make an existing emission limit or standard more stringent, or impose new or more stringent monitoring, reporting, or recordkeeping requirements; and

**WHEREAS**, the Governing Board further finds that an incremental cost-effectiveness analysis pursuant to Section 40920.6(a) of the California Health and Safety Code is not required for proposed amended Rule 1210; and

**WHEREAS**, the Governing Board further finds that an assessment of the socioeconomic impacts of proposed amended Rule 1210 is not required pursuant to Section 40728.5 of the California Health and Safety Code as the proposed amended rule will not significantly affect air quality or emissions limitations.

**NOW THEREFORE IT IS RESOLVED AND ORDERED** by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Governing Board that the Rules and Regulations of the Air Pollution Control District of San Diego County be, and hereby are amended as follows:

1. Proposed amended Rule 1210 is to read as follows:

**RULE 1210. TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT HEALTH RISKS –  
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION**  
(Rev. Adopted & Effective *(date of adoption)*)  
(Table I - Toxic Air Contaminants: Rev. Effective *(date of adoption)*)  
(Table II - Toxic Air Contaminants: Rev. Effective *(date of adoption)*)  
(Table III - Toxic Air Contaminants: Rev. Effective *(date of adoption)*)

(a) **APPLICABILITY**

This rule is applicable to each existing stationary source required to prepare a health risk assessment, as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer pursuant to the priority system and procedures set out in Section 44360 of the California Health and Safety Code.

(b) **EXEMPTIONS**

The provisions of Sections (d) Public Notification and Public Meeting Requirements and Section (e) Risk Reduction Audits and Plans shall not apply to stationary sources for

which industry-wide health risk assessments are prepared by the Air Pollution Control Officer pursuant to Section 44323 of the California Health and Safety Code.

(c) **DEFINITIONS**

(1) **"Airborne Toxic Risk Reduction Measure(s)"** means physical or operational changes or control measures implemented at a stationary source that reduce or eliminate toxic air contaminant emissions and associated health risks, whose reductions are real, permanent, quantifiable, and enforceable through District permits or permit conditions. Airborne toxic risk reduction measures may include changes in production processes, feed stock modifications, product reformulations, production system modifications, system enclosures or relocations within the facility, removal from service, emissions capture, emissions control, emissions conversion, or modifications to operational standards or practices. Airborne toxic risk reduction measures do not include measures which will result in an increased health risk to the public from exposures to the toxic chemical in another media.

(2) **"Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT)"** means the most effective emission limitation, or retrofit emission control device or control technique, which:

(i) has been achieved in practice for that source or category of source; or

(ii) is any other emissions limitation or retrofit control technique found by the Air Pollution Control Officer to be technically feasible for that source or category of source, or for a specific source, while taking into consideration the cost of achieving health risk reductions, any non-air quality health and environmental impacts, and energy requirements.

(3) **"Cancer Burden"** means the estimated increase in the occurrence of cancer cases in a population subject to an individual cancer risk of equal to or greater than one in one million resulting from exposure to toxic air contaminants.

(4) **"Emissions Inventory Report"** means a document that identifies and describes sources of toxic air contaminant emissions at a stationary source, characterizes the nature of the discharge of such contaminants, and quantifies the types and amounts of toxic air contaminants emitted from each source.

(5) **"Emissions Inventory Year"** means the year in which the emissions occurred and for which an emissions inventory is required pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 44340 et seq.

(6) **"Emission Unit"** means the same as defined in Rule 2 – Definitions.

(7) **"Health Risk Assessment"** means a detailed comprehensive analysis prepared pursuant to Section 44361 of the California Health and Safety Code to evaluate and predict the dispersion of hazardous substances in the environment and the

potential for exposure of human populations and to assess and quantify both the individual and population wide health risks associated with those levels of exposure.

(8) **"Individual Substance Acute Health Hazard Index"** means, for each air contaminant, the ratio of the maximum estimated concentration of that contaminant in the ambient air for the specified averaging time for a given acute health effect to the applicable reference exposure level for that contaminant for the same averaging time.

(9) **"Individual Substance Chronic Health Hazard Index"** means, for each air contaminant, the ratio of the maximum estimated concentration of that contaminant in the ambient air for the specified averaging time for a given chronic health effect to the applicable reference exposure level for that contaminant for the same averaging time.

(10) **"Industry-Wide Health Risk Assessment"** means a study to identify, characterize, and quantify the health risks that may result from emissions of toxic air contaminants from a class of stationary sources which the Air Pollution Control Officer finds meets all of the following:

(i) All stationary sources within the class fall within one four-digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code.

(ii) Individual preparation of emission inventory reports and health risk assessments would impose severe economic hardships on the majority of stationary sources within the class.

(iii) The majority of the class is composed of small businesses.

(iv) Releases of toxic air contaminants from individual stationary sources in the class can easily and generically be characterized and calculated.

(11) **"Isopleth"** means the boundaries of the area that is exposed to health risks at or above the significant risk threshold(s).

(12) **"Maximum Individual Cancer Risk"** means the estimated probability of a maximally exposed individual contracting cancer as a result of exposure to toxic air contaminants emitted from a stationary source.

(13) **"Prioritization Score"** means a value indicative of a stationary source's toxic air contaminant emissions strength, arrived at by utilizing emissions data contained in an approved emission inventory report, air contaminant toxicity data recommended by the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, and a calculation methodology established by the Air Pollution Control Officer. Separate prioritization scores are determined for toxic air contaminants with the potential for causing carcinogenic effects, noncarcinogenic acute effects, and noncarcinogenic chronic effects.

(14) **"Risk Reduction Audit and Plan"** means a study prepared by the owner or operator, or representative, of a stationary source which identifies sources and emissions of toxic air contaminants at the stationary source that contribute to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s) and which proposes airborne toxic risk reduction measures that are sufficient to reduce health risks from such emissions to below the significant risk threshold(s).

(15) **"School"** means any public or private school used for the education of more than 12 children in one or more grades from preschool through grade 12, but does not include any school in which education is primarily conducted in a private home.

(16) **"Sensitive Receptors"** include hospitals, healthcare facilities (e.g., community clinics) schools, day care facilities, elderly housing and convalescent facilities, libraries, and other facilities where the occupants are more susceptible to the adverse effects of exposure to toxic air contaminants, as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

(17) **"Significant Risk Threshold"** means any of the following health risk levels:

- (i) Except as provided in Subsection (e)(1)(ii), maximum individual cancer risks equal to or greater than 10 in one million, or
- (ii) Cancer burden equal to or greater than 1.0, or
- (iii) Total acute noncancer health hazard index equal to or greater than 1.0, or
- (iv) Total chronic noncancer health hazard index equal to or greater than 1.0.

(18) **"Small Business"** means the same as defined in California Government Code Section 11342.610.

(19) **"Stationary Source"** means the same as defined in Rule 2 – Definitions.

(20) **"Technically Feasible"** means a control technology or technique that has been achieved in practice, as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

(21) **"Total Acute Noncancer Health Hazard Index"** means the estimated risk of acute health effects and is the sum of the individual substance acute health hazard indexes affecting the same target organ system for a maximally exposed individual for all toxic air contaminants emitted from a stationary source and identified in Table III.

(22) **"Total Chronic Noncancer Health Hazard Index"** means the estimated risk of chronic health effects and is the sum of the individual substance chronic health hazard indexes affecting the same target organ system for a maximally exposed individual for all toxic air contaminants emitted from a stationary source and identified in Table II.



(23) **"Toxic Air Contaminant"** means the air contaminants listed in Table I (carcinogenic), Table II (noncarcinogenic-chronic) or Table III (noncarcinogenic-acute), which have a health standard approved by the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA).

The Air Pollution Control Officer may revise Tables I, II or III upon OEHHA adoption of any new or revised health standard and 30 days after public notice of the proposed changes is published in a newspaper of general circulation. A member of the public may petition the Air Pollution Control Officer to add toxic air contaminants to these tables.

**(d) PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND PUBLIC MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

(1) The owner or operator of each stationary source for which a health risk assessment has been approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer and which risk assessment indicates health risks at or above the significant risk threshold(s), shall provide written public notice of such risks and conduct a public meeting in accordance with the provisions of Subsections (d)(2) through (d)(11).

Public notice shall be by direct mailing, to each resident, business, parent or guardian of each student, and administrators of each school, hospital, day care center, convalescent home and any other sensitive receptor within the isopleth exposed to health risks at or above the significant risk threshold(s).

(2) Within 45 days of the date of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer that public notification is required, the owner or operator of a stationary source shall prepare and submit to the Air Pollution Control Officer, for approval, a public notification plan. The plan shall include all of the following:

(i) A proposed public notification letter to be signed by the Air Pollution Control Officer. The proposed notification letter shall be identical in form and text to the model notification letter provided by the Air Pollution Control Officer and shall include the additional stationary source-specific information required by the model notification letter. When applicable, the proposed public notification letter shall also include information about the required public meeting, such as date and location of the meeting and/or how the public can participate in the meeting if the meeting is virtual.

(ii) Any proposed optional stationary source informational letter to accompany the public notification letter which shall comply with the requirements of Subsection (d)(3)(iv).

(iii) Clear and readable maps with isopleths.

(iv) The name, e-mail address, and phone number of the person(s) responsible for coordinating public notification and the public meeting for the stationary source.

(v) A description of the proposed methodology, such as the use of a mailing service, for obtaining the addresses of residents and persons to be notified and for carrying out the notification process.

(vi) A list of all addresses to be included in the notification area.

(vii) A list of all schools, hospitals, day care centers, convalescent homes and other sensitive receptors to be notified and a proposal on how the owner or operator will notify businesses and/or sensitive receptors pursuant to Subsections (d)(3)(v) and (vi).

(viii) A list of the primary languages spoken by non-English speaking persons in the area to receive notification where such language is the primary language of 5% or more of the total persons to be notified in any census tract in the area to receive notification.

(ix) A proposed method, including a timeline and due date, for responding to public comments and requests.

The Air Pollution Control Officer shall approve, or revise and approve, the public notification plan within 30 days of receipt of the plan.

(3) Within 30 days of the date of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer of the approval of the public notification plan, the owner or operator of a stationary source shall implement the approved public notification plan. Each written public notice shall contain only:

(i) The approved public notification letter signed by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

(ii) An “Air Toxics Hot Spots Fact Sheet” and a “Public Response Survey Card” reproduced from originals provided by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

(iii) A copy of the maps, with the isopleths, that was submitted with the notification plan pursuant to Subsection (d)(2)(iii).

(iv) An optional stationary source informational letter that has been approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer and shall enhance and not undermine the health risk notification process. The content of the optional stationary source informational letter shall be limited to the following:

(A) A discussion of toxic air contaminants emitted, emission rates, and the reasons why the emissions occur.

(B) A discussion of steps taken by the stationary source to reduce emissions or health risks to the public.

(C) A brief and factual discussion of the health risk assessment results and the health protective assumptions of the health risk assessment.

(D) The name, e-mail address, and phone number of the stationary source contact(s) regarding the public notification, the public meeting, and the health risk assessment.

(v) For each public notification directed to a business, that the business post or circulate the District public notification letter for review by all on-site employees of the business.

(vi) For each public notification directed to a school, a request that the administrator of the school, or an assignee of the administrator, distribute notices provided by the owner or operator of a stationary source to the parents or guardians of students attending the school. The cost of such distribution shall be paid by the owner or operator.

(vii) At the option of the owner or operator, a notice to carry out the warning requirements of Section 25249.6 of the California Health and Safety Code provided such notice has been determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer not to conflict with the intent or content of the public notifications required by this rule.

(4) Multilingual notifications shall be provided by the owner or operator of a stationary source if 5% or more of the recipients within any census tract in the area to receive notification are non-English speaking. In such case, the notifications shall be provided in those languages which are the primary language of 5% or more of the total persons to be notified in that census tract.

(5) Distribution of the public notice must be conducted by the U.S. Postal Service or other postage provider. The cost of distribution of the public notice shall be paid by the owner or operator of the stationary source.

(6) Each public notification shall be mailed in an envelope supplied by the Air Pollution Control Officer and addressed to "Current Resident" of private residences, businesses, or sensitive receptors.

(7) If the owner or operator of a stationary source fails to carry out the public notification requirements, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall carry out such notification at the earliest possible date. All District costs of such notification shall be paid by the owner or operator.

(8) The owner or operator of a stationary source shall provide subsequent public notification biennially, in accordance with the procedures of this rule and shall include the status of the risk reduction plan, when applicable, in the notification. The owner or operator may cease biennial public notification upon demonstrating, to the satisfaction of the Air Pollution Control Officer, that health risks have been reduced to below the

significant risk threshold(s) or the owner or operator is not required by the Air Pollution Control Officer to prepare a health risk assessment based on the most recent prioritization score.

(9) Within 15 days of the date of distribution of public notification materials, the owner or operator of a stationary source shall submit to the Air Pollution Control Officer proof of distribution which shall include:

- (i) the addresses included in the mailing and receipts from the U.S. Postal Service or other postage provider, and
- (ii) a copy of all information provided by the owner or operator to the public pursuant to the notification requirements of this rule, and
- (iii) a description of how the owner or operator notified businesses and/or sensitive receptors pursuant to Subsections (d)(3)(v) and (vi).

(10) Within 30 days of the initial public notification, or the biennial public notification if applicable as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer, the owner or operator of a stationary source shall conduct a public meeting, in coordination with the Air Pollution Control Officer, and shall:

- (i) Reserve a venue for the public meeting at a time that facilitates public attendance. The venue shall be located within, or if not feasible, nearby the notification area. A virtual public meeting may be conducted with approval from the Air Pollution Control Officer.
- (ii) Make all necessary arrangements for the meeting including, but not limited to, providing for audio visual equipment and personnel. Interpreters shall be present if a multilingual public notification is required pursuant to Subsection (d)(4).
- (iii) Attend the meeting to answer any questions related to the stationary source operations.
- (iv) Bear the costs, including District costs, of holding the meeting.

(11) The Air Pollution Control Officer, or designee, shall establish the agenda of the meeting, in collaboration with the owner or operator of the stationary source, and attend each public meeting to provide information regarding the Air Toxics Hot Spots Program and the results of the health risk assessment.

**(e) RISK REDUCTION AUDITS AND PLANS**

(1) Within 180 days of receipt of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer that a stationary source's most recent approved health risk assessment indicates health risks at or above the significant risk threshold(s), the owner or operator shall submit to the Air Pollution Control Officer, for completeness review and approval, a

risk reduction audit and plan. For the purpose of this section, the significant risk threshold for maximum individual cancer risk shall be:

- (i) equal to or greater than 10 in one million for emissions inventory years 2018 and later, or
- (ii) equal to or greater than 100 in one million for emissions inventory years prior to 2018.

The risk reduction audit and plan shall comply with the requirements of Subsection (e)(2). Such risk reductions shall be accomplished within five years of the date the plan is approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer, unless an extension has been granted pursuant to Subsections (e)(4) or (e)(5).

(2) The risk reduction audit and plan submitted by the owner or operator shall be accompanied by appropriate application(s) to implement the plan and contain all of the following:

- (i) The name and location of the stationary source.
- (ii) A facility risk characterization which includes an updated emissions inventory report and health risk assessment, if the risk due to total facility emissions has increased to above or decreased to below the levels indicated in the previously approved health risk assessment.
- (iii) The identification of all the emission unit(s) for which the owner or operator proposes to reduce toxic air contaminant emissions and the identification of the airborne toxic risk reduction measures proposed for implementation to reduce such emissions, and the anticipated emission and health risk reductions.
- (iv) A schedule for implementing the proposed airborne toxic risk reduction measures within five years. The schedule shall include specific increments of progress towards implementing the airborne toxic risk reduction measures.
- (v) A demonstration, including supporting documentation such as emission calculations, that the proposed airborne toxic risk reduction measures will reduce or eliminate toxic air contaminant emissions from the stationary source. The demonstration shall be made through analogy with the approved health risk assessment for the stationary source or by submission of a revised forecast risk assessment. The demonstration also shall include any foreseeable new or increased emissions of toxic air contaminants from the stationary source and the estimated health risks resulting from such new or increased emissions during the period approved for implementation of the risk reduction audit and plan.
- (vi) A schedule for providing progress reports on reductions in emissions of toxic air contaminants and estimated health risks achieved under the implemented plan. Progress reports shall be provided not less frequently than within 12 months

from when the plan is approved, and annually thereafter, and may be incorporated into emission inventory report updates required pursuant to Section 44344 of the California Health and Safety Code.

(3) Within 30 days of receipt of a risk reduction audit and plan submitted pursuant to Subsection (e)(2), the Air Pollution Control Officer shall provide public notice of such plan receipt and make the risk reduction audit and plan available for public review and provide for a 30-day comment period.

(4) The Air Pollution Control Officer may, upon a request pursuant to Subsection (e)(6), allow a 3-year extension for an owner or operator of a stationary source to reduce risks to below the significant risk threshold(s) provided the owner or operator has installed T-BARCT on all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s).

(5) The Air Pollution Control Officer may, upon a request pursuant to Subsection (e)(6), allow subsequent 3-year extensions for an owner or operator of a stationary source to reduce risks to below the significant risk threshold(s) provided the owner or operator has implemented all technically feasible measures on all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s).

(6) The owner or operator of a stationary source requesting an extension to reduce risks to below the significant risk threshold(s) shall submit the extension request to the Air Pollution Control Officer, in the manner and form prescribed by the Air Pollution Control Officer. The extension request shall include all of the following:

(i) Demonstration that T-BARCT and/or all technically feasible control measures, as applicable, have been installed or implemented on all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s).

(ii) Quantification of the risk reduction that has been achieved by the implementation of T-BARCT and/or all technically feasible control measures, as applicable, from all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s).

(iii) An implementation schedule which shall include dates for installation and/or implementation of all technically feasible control measures, as applicable.

The Air Pollution Control Officer may impose conditions on the approval of additional time, as necessary, to ensure that airborne toxic risk reduction measures that are technically feasible are implemented as expeditiously as possible.

(7) Within 30 days of receipt of an extension request, pursuant to Subsections (e)(4) and (e)(5), the Air Pollution Control Officer shall provide public notice of such extension request and make the extension request available for public review and provide for a 30-day comment period.

(8) At least 30 days prior to the approval of any extension request, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall conduct a public meeting to discuss the proposed extension and obtain input from the public.

(9) If the Air Pollution Control Officer finds that the risk reduction audit and plan is not approvable, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall notify the owner or operator in writing and may remand the plan to the owner or operator for further revision. An approvable plan shall be submitted by the owner or operator within 60 days of such notification. If an approvable plan is not submitted, the Air Pollution Control Officer may disapprove the plan and find the owner or operator to be in violation of this rule.

(10) The Air Pollution Control Officer may require that a risk reduction audit and plan be revised and resubmitted if the Air Pollution Control Officer receives new information regarding toxic air contaminant emissions from the stationary source or alternative airborne toxic risk reduction measures that would significantly impact or reduce risks to exposed persons. A revised plan shall be submitted by the owner or operator within 60 days of such notification.

**(f) PROGRAM FEES**

All costs incurred by the Air Pollution Control Officer associated with the public notification, public meeting, and risk reduction audit and plan requirements of this rule in conjunction with an affected stationary source shall be paid by the owner or operator of that stationary source in accordance with Subsection (f)(6) Toxic Hot Spots, of Rule 40 – Permit and Other Fees.

**Table I****Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Carcinogenic Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Acetaldehyde	75-07-0	6/12/1996
Acetamide	60-35-5	1/11/2001
Acrylamide	79-06-1	6/12/1996
Acrylonitrile	107-13-1	6/12/1996
Allyl chloride	107-05-1	1/11/2001
2-Aminoanthraquinone	117-79-3	1/11/2001
Aniline	62-53-3	1/11/2001
Arsenic (inorganic) and compounds	7440-38-2	6/12/1996
Asbestos	1332-21-4	6/12/1996
Benzene	71-43-2	6/12/1996
Benzidine (and its salts) as follows:	92-87-5	6/12/1996
Benzidine based dyes	1020	6/12/1996
Direct Black 38	1937-37-7	6/12/1996
Direct Blue 6	2602-46-2	6/12/1996
Direct Brown 95 (technical grade)	16071-86-6	6/12/1996
Benzyl chloride	100-44-7	1/11/2001
Beryllium and compounds	7440-41-7	6/12/1996
Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether (Dichloroethyl ether)	111-44-4	1/11/2001
Bis (chloromethyl) ether	542-88-1	1/11/2001
Potassium Bromate	7758-01-2	1/11/2001
1,3-Butadiene	106-99-0	6/12/1996
Cadmium and compounds	7440-43-9	6/12/1996
Carbon tetrachloride (tetrachloromethane)	56-23-5	6/12/1996
Chlorinated Paraffins	108171-26-2	1/11/2001
4-Chloro-o-phenylenediamine	95-83-0	1/11/2001
Chloroform	67-66-3	6/12/1996
Chlorophenols as follows:	N/A	6/12/1996
Pentachlorophenol	87-86-5	6/12/1996
2, 4, 6 - trichlorophenol	88-06-2	6/12/1996
P-chloro-o-toluidine	95-69-2	1/11/2001
Chromium (hexavalent) and compounds including, but not limited to:	18540-29-9	6/12/1996
Barium chromate	10294-40-3	6/12/1996
Calcium chromate	13765-19-0	6/12/1996
Lead chromate	7758-97-6	6/12/1996
Sodium dichromate	10588-01-9	6/12/1996
Strontium chromate	7789-06-2	6/12/1996
Chromium trioxide (as chromic acid mist)	1333-82-0	6/12/1996
Cobalt	7440-48-4	2/26/2021
P-cresidine	120-71-8	1/11/2001
Cupferron	135-20-6	1/11/2001
2,4-diaminoanisole	615-05-4	1/11/2001
2,4-diaminotoluene	95-80-7	1/11/2001
1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	96-12-8	6/12/1996
P-dichlorobenzene	106-46-7	6/12/1996



**Table I - continued**

Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Carcinogenic Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
3,3-dichlorobenzidine	91-94-1	6/12/1996
1,1-dichloroethane (ethylidene dichloride)	75-34-3	1/11/2001
Di (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP)	117-81-7	6/12/1996
P-dimethylaminoazobenzene	60-11-7	1/11/2001
2,4-dinitrotoluene	121-14-2	1/11/2001
1,4-dioxane (1,4-diethylene dioxide)	123-91-1	6/12/1996
Epichlorohydrin (1-chloro-2,3-epoxypropane)	106-89-8	6/12/1996
Ethyl benzene	100-41-4	11/14/2007
Ethylene dibromide (1, 2 - dibromoethane)	106-93-4	6/12/1996
Ethylene dichloride (1, 2 – dichloroethane)	107-06-2	6/12/1996
Ethylene oxide (1,2-epoxyethane)	75-21-8	6/12/1996
Ethylene thiourea	96-45-7	1/11/2001
Formaldehyde	50-00-0	6/12/1996
Hexachlorobenzene	118-74-1	6/12/1996
Hexachlorocyclohexanes (mixed or technical grade)	608-73-1	6/12/1996
Alpha - hexachlorocyclohexane	319-84-6	6/12/1996
Beta - hexachlorocyclohexane	319-85-7	6/12/1996
Gamma - hexachlorocyclohexane (Lindane)	58-89-9	6/12/1996
Hydrazine	302-01-2	6/12/1996
Lead (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7439-92-1	1/11/2001
Lead acetate	301-04-2	1/11/2001
Lead phosphate	7446-27-7	1/11/2001
Lead subacetate	1335-32-6	1/11/2001
Methyl tertiary-butyl ether	1634-04-4	1/11/2001
4,4'-methylene bis (2-chloroaniline) (MOCA)	101-14-4	1/11/2001
Methylene chloride (dichloromethane)	75-09-2	6/12/1996
4,4'-Methylene dianiline (and its dichloride)	101-77-9	1/11/2001
Michler's Ketone (4,4'-Bis (dimethylamino) benzophenone)	90-94-8	1/11/2001
N-nitrosodi-n-butylamine	924-16-3	6/12/1996
N-nitrosodi-n-propylamine	621-64-7	6/12/1996
N-nitrosodiethylamine	55-18-5	6/12/1996
N-nitrosodimethylamine	62-75-9	6/12/1996
N-nitrosodiphenylamine	86-30-6	1/11/2001
N-nitroso-n-methylethylamine	10595-95-6	6/12/1996
N-nitrosomorpholine	59-89-2	6/12/1996
N-nitrosopiperidine	100-75-4	6/12/1996
N-nitrosopyrrolidine	930-55-2	6/12/1996
Naphthalene	91-20-3	8/03/2004
Nickel and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-02-0	6/12/1996
Nickel acetate	373-02-4	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonate	3333-67-3	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonyl	13463-39-3	6/12/1996
Nickel hydroxide	12054-48-7	6/12/1996
Nickelocene	1271-28-9	6/12/1996

**Table I – continued**

**Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Carcinogenic Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Nickel oxide	1313-99-1	6/12/1996
Nickel refinery dust from the pyrometallurgical process	1146	6/12/1996
Nickel subsulfide	12035-72-2	6/12/1996
p-Nitrosodiphenylamine	156-10-5	6/12/1996
Particulate emissions from diesel-fueled engines	9901	9/15/2000
Perchloroethylene (tetrachloroethylene)	127-18-4	6/12/1996
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) unspciated mixtures	1336-36-3	6/12/1996
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) speciated as follows:	N/A	
3,3',4,4'-tetrachlorobiphenyl	32598-13-3	8/29/2003
3,4,4',5-tetrachlorobiphenyl	70362-50-4	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4'-pentachlorobiphenyl	32598-14-4	8/29/2003
2,3,4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	74472-37-0	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	31508-00-6	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5'-pentachlorobiphenyl	65510-44-3	8/29/2003
3,3',4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	57465-28-8	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5-hexachlorobiphenyl	38380-08-4	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	69782-90-7	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5,5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	52663-72-6	8/29/2003
3,3',4,4',5,5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	32774-16-6	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5,5'-heptachlorobiphenyl	39635-31-9	8/29/2003
Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD) as follows:	1086	6/12/1996
2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	1746-01-6	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8-pentachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	40321-76-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8-hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	39227-28-6	6/12/1996
1,2,3,6,7,8-hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	57653-85-7	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8,9-hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	19408-74-3	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-heptachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	35822-46-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-octachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	3268-87-9	6/12/1996
Polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDF) as follows:	1080	6/12/1996
2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzofuran	5120-73-19	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8-pentachlorodibenzofuran	57117-41-6	6/12/1996
2,3,4,7,8-pentachlorodibenzofuran	57117-31-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8-hexachlorodibenzofuran	70648-26-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,6,7,8- hexachlorodibenzofuran	57117-44-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8,9- hexachlorodibenzofuran	72918-21-9	6/12/1996
2,3,4,6,7,8-hexachlorodibenzofuran	60851-34-5	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-heptachlorodibenzofuran	67562-39-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-heptachlorodibenzofuran	55673-89-7	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-octachlorodibenzofuran	39001-02-0	6/12/1996
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon (PAH) as follows:	1151	6/12/1996
Benz[a]anthracene	56-55-3	6/12/1996
Benzo[a]pyrene	50-32-8	6/12/1996
Benzo[b]fluoranthene	205-99-2	6/12/1996
Benzo[j]fluoranthene	205-82-3	6/12/1996
Benzo[k]fluoranthene	207-08-9	6/12/1996

**Table I - continued**

**Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Carcinogenic Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Chrysene	218-01-9	6/12/1996
Dibenz[a,h]acridine	226-36-8	6/12/1996
Dibenz[a,j]acridine	224-42-0	6/12/1996
Dibenz[a,h]anthracene	53-70-3	6/12/1996
Dibenzo[a,e]pyrene	192-65-4	6/12/1996
Dibenzo[a,h]pyrene	189-64-0	6/12/1996
Dibenzo[a,i]pyrene	189-55-9	6/12/1996
Dibenzo[a,l]pyrene	191-30-0	6/12/1996
7h-dibenzo[c,g]carbazole	194-59-2	6/12/1996
7,12-dimethylbenz[a]anthracene	57-97-6	6/12/1996
1,6-dinitropyrene	42397-64-8	6/12/1996
1,8-dinitropyrene	42397-65-9	6/12/1996
Indeno[1,2,3-c,d]pyrene	193-39-5	6/12/1996
3-methylcholanthrene	56-49-5	6/12/1996
5-methylchrysene	3697-24-3	6/12/1996
Naphthalene	91-20-3	8/03/2004
5-nitroacenaphthene	602-87-9	6/12/1996
6-nitrochrysene	7496-02-8	6/12/1996
2-nitrofluorene	607-57-8	6/12/1996
1-nitropyrene	5522-43-0	6/12/1996
4-nitropyrene	57835-92-4	6/12/1996
1,3-propane sultone	1120-71-4	1/11/2001
Propylene oxide	75-56-9	6/12/1996
Tertiary butyl-acetate (TBAc)	540-88-5	5/29/2019
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	79-34-5	1/11/2001
Thioacetamide	62-55-5	6/12/1996
Toluene diisocyanates including, but not limited to:	26471-62-5	1/11/2001
Toluene-2,4-diisocyanate	584-84-9	1/11/2001
Toluene-2,6-diisocyanate	91-08-7	1/11/2001
1,1,2-Trichloroethane (vinyl trichloride)	79-00-5	1/11/2001
Trichlorethylene	79-01-6	6/12/1996
Urethane (ethyl carbamate)	51-79-6	6/12/1996
Vinyl chloride (chloroethylene)	75-01-4	6/12/1996

- a. Unit Risk Values shall be obtained from any health risk assessment guidelines adopted by OEHHA. Table I was last revised pursuant to Rule 1200(c)(23) on 2/26/2021 and Rule 1210(c)(23) on *(date of adoption)*.
- b. Chemical Abstract Service Number (CAS): For chemical groupings and mixtures where a CAS number is not applicable, the 4-digit code used in the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Emission Inventory Criteria and Guidelines (EICG) Report is listed. For information on the origin and use of the 4-digit code, see the EICG report.

**Table II****Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Chronic Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Acetaldehyde	75-07-0	6/12/1996
Acrolein	107-02-8	1/11/2001
Acrylonitrile	107-13-1	6/12/1996
Ammonia	7664-41-7	6/12/1996
Arsenic (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-38-2	6/12/1996
Arsine	7784-42-1	6/12/1996
Benzene	71-43-2	6/12/1996
Beryllium and compounds	7440-41-7	6/12/1996
1,3-butadiene	106-99-0	1/11/2001
Cadmium and compounds	7440-43-9	6/12/1996
Caprolactam	105-60-2	6/16/2014
Carbon disulfide	75-15-0	1/11/2001
Carbon tetrachloride (tetrachloromethane)	56-23-5	6/12/1996
Carbonyl sulfide	463-58-1	7/11/2017
Chlorine	7782-50-5	6/12/1996
Chlorine dioxide	10049-04-4	1/11/2001
Chlorobenzene	108-90-7	6/12/1996
Chloroform	67-66-3	6/12/1996
Chloropicrin	76-06-2	6/12/1996
Chromium (hexavalent) and compounds including, but not limited to:	18540-29-9	6/12/1996
Barium chromate	10294-40-3	6/12/1996
Calcium chromate	13765-19-0	6/12/1996
Lead chromate	7758-97-6	6/12/1996
Sodium dichromate	10588-01-9	6/12/1996
Strontium chromate	7789-06-2	6/12/1996
Chromium trioxide (as chromic acid mist)	1333-82-0	3/12/2001
Cresols (mixtures of)	1319-77-3	6/12/1996
m-cresol	108-39-4	6/12/1996
o-cresol	95-48-7	6/12/1996
p-cresol	106-44-5	6/12/1996
Cyanide (inorganic)	57-12-5	1/11/2001
Hydrogen cyanide (hydrocyanic acid)	74-90-8	6/12/1996
P – dichlorobenzene (1,4-dichlorobenzene)	106-46-7	6/12/1996
Diethanolamine	111-42-2	1/14/2002
N,n-dimethyl formamide	68-12-2	1/11/2001
1,4-dioxane	123-91-1	6/12/1996
Epichlorohydrin (1-chloro-2,3-epoxypropane)	106-89-8	6/12/1996
1,2-epoxybutane	106-88-7	1/11/2001
Ethyl benzene	100-41-4	1/11/2001
Ethyl chloride	75-00-3	6/12/1996
Ethylene dibromide (1,2-Dibromoethane)	106-93-4	6/12/1996
Ethylene dichloride (1,2-Dichloroethane)	107-06-2	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol	107-21-1	6/12/1996
Ethylene oxide	75-21-8	6/12/1996

**Table II – continued**

Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Chronic Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Fluorides and Compounds	1101	1/11/2001
Hydrogen fluoride (hydrofluoric acid)	7664-39-3	6/12/1996
Formaldehyde	50-00-0	6/12/1996
Glutaraldehyde	111-30-8	6/12/1996
Glycol Ethers as follows:	N/A	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol butyl ether – EGBE	111-76-2	7/19/2018
Ethylene glycol ethyl ether – EGEE	110-80-5	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol ethyl ether acetate – EGEEA	111-15-9	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol methyl ether – EGME	109-86-4	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol methyl ether acetate – EGMEA	110-49-6	6/12/1996
1,6-hexamethylene diisocyanate (monomer)	822-06-0	9/29/2020
n-Hexane	110-54-3	1/11/2001
Hydrazine	302-01-2	6/12/1996
Hydrochloric acid	7647-01-0	6/12/1996
Hydrogen sulfide	7783-06-4	6/12/1996
Isophorone	78-59-1	1/14/2002
Isopropyl alcohol (Isopropanol)	67-63-0	1/11/2001
Maleic anhydride	108-31-6	6/12/1996
Manganese	7439-96-5	6/12/1996
Mercury (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7439-97-6	6/12/1996
Mercuric chloride	7487-94-7	6/12/1996
Methanol	67-56-1	6/12/1996
Methyl bromide (Bromomethane)	74-83-9	6/12/1996
Methyl tert-butyl ether	1634-04-4	1/11/2001
Methyl chloroform (1, 1, 1 – TCA)	71-55-6	6/12/1996
Methyl isocyanate	624-83-9	6/12/1996
Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane)	75-09-2	6/12/1996
4,4'-methylene dianiline (and its dichloride)	101-77-9	6/12/1996
Methylene diphenyl diisocyanate (Polymeric)	101-68-8	6/12/1996
Naphthalene	91-20-3	6/12/1996
Nickel and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-02-0	6/12/1996
Nickel acetate	373-02-4	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonate	3333-67-3	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonyl	13463-39-3	6/12/1996
Nickel hydroxide	12054-48-7	6/12/1996
Nickelocene	1271-28-9	6/12/1996
Nickel oxide	1313-99-1	6/12/1996
Nickel refinery dust from the pyrometallurgical process	1146	6/12/1996
Nickel subsulfide	12035-72-2	6/12/1996
Particulate emissions from diesel-fueled engines	9901	9/15/2000
Perchloroethylene (Tetrachloroethylene)	127-18-4	6/12/1996
Phenol	108-95-2	6/12/1996
Phosphine	7803-51-2	6/12/1996
Phosphoric acid	7664-38-2	6/12/1996
Phthalic anhydride	85-44-9	6/12/1996

**Table II – continued**

Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Chronic Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) speciated as follows:	N/A	
3,3',4,4'-tetrachlorobiphenyl	32598-13-3	8/29/2003
3,4,4',5-tetrachlorobiphenyl	70362-50-4	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4'-pentachlorobiphenyl	32598-14-4	8/29/2003
2,3,4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	74472-37-0	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	31508-00-6	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5'-pentachlorobiphenyl	65510-44-3	8/29/2003
3,3',4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	57465-28-8	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5-hexachlorobiphenyl	38380-08-4	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	69782-90-7	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5,5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	52663-72-6	8/29/2003
3,3',4,4',5,5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	32774-16-6	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5,5'-heptachlorobiphenyl	39635-31-9	8/29/2003
Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD) as follows:	1086	6/12/1996
2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	1746-01-6	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	40321-76-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	39227-28-6	6/12/1996
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	57653-85-7	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	19408-74-3	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	35822-46-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-Octachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	3268-87-9	6/12/1996
Polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDF) as follows:	1080	6/12/1996
2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzofuran	5120-73-19	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran	57117-41-6	6/12/1996
2,3,4,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran	57117-31-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	70648-26-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	57117-44-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	72918-21-9	6/12/1996
2,3,4,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	60851-34-5	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzofuran	67562-39-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-Heptachlorodibenzofuran	55673-89-7	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-Octachlorodibenzofuran	39001-02-0	6/12/1996
Propylene (propene)	115-07-1	1/11/2001
Propylene glycol monomethyl ether	107-98-2	6/12/1996
Propylene oxide	75-56-9	6/12/1996
Selenium including, but not limited to:	7782-49-2	6/12/1996
Selenium sulfide	7446-34-6	6/12/1996
Silica (crystalline, respirable)	1175	10/11/2013
Styrene	100-42-5	6/12/1996
Sulfuric acid	7664-93-9	7/11/2017
Sulfur trioxide	7446-71-9	7/11/2017
Toluene	108-88-3	6/12/1996
Toluene diisocyanates	26471-62-5	6/12/1996
Toluene-2,4-diisocyanate	584-84-9	6/12/1996
Toluene-2,6-diisocyanate	91-08-7	6/12/1996
Trichloroethylene	79-01-6	6/12/1996

**Table II – continued**

Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Chronic Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Triethylamine	121-44-8	1/11/2001
Vinyl acetate	108-05-4	1/11/2001
Vinylidene chloride	75-35-4	6/12/1996
Xylenes (mixed isomers)	1330-20-7	6/12/1996
m-Xylene	108-38-3	6/12/1996
o-Xylene	95-47-6	6/12/1996
p-Xylene	106-42-3	6/12/1996

- a. Reference Exposure Levels (RELs) and toxic endpoint information shall be obtained from any health risk assessment guidelines adopted by OEHHA. Table II was last revised pursuant to Rule 1200(c)(23) on 9/29/20 and Rule 1210(c)(23) on *(date of adoption)*.
- b. Chemical Abstract Service Number (CAS): For chemical groupings and mixtures where a CAS number is not applicable, the 4-digit code used in the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Emission Inventory Criteria and Guidelines (EICG) Report is listed. For information on the origin and use of the 4-digit code, see the EICG report.

**Table III**Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Acute Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Acetaldehyde	75-07-0	1/28/2009
Acrolein	107-02-8	1/11/2001
Acrylic acid	79-10-7	1/11/2001
Ammonia	7664-41-7	6/12/1996
Arsenic (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-38-2	6/12/1996
Arsine	7784-42-1	6/12/1996
Benzene	71-43-2	6/12/1996
Benzyl chloride	100-44-7	6/12/1996
1,3-butadiene	106-99-0	10/11/2013
Caprolactam	105-60-2	6/16/2014
Carbon disulfide	75-15-0	1/11/2001
Carbon monoxide	630-08-0	1/11/2001
Carbon tetrachloride (tetrachloromethane)	56-23-5	6/12/1996
Carbonyl sulfide	463-58-1	7/11/2017
Chlorine	7782-50-5	6/12/1996
Chloroform	67-66-3	6/12/1996
Chloropicrin	76-06-2	1/11/2001
Copper and compounds	7440-50-8	6/12/1996
Cyanide (inorganic)	57-12-5	6/12/1996
Hydrogen cyanide (hydrocyanic acid)	74-90-8	6/12/1996
1,4-Dioxane (1,4-diethylene dioxide)	123-91-1	6/12/1996
Epichlorohydrin (1-chloro-2,3-epoxypropane)	106-89-8	1/11/2001
Fluorides and Compounds	1101	6/12/1996
Hydrogen fluoride (hydrofluoric acid)	7664-39-3	6/12/1996
Formaldehyde	50-00-0	6/12/1996
Glycol ethers as follows:	N/A	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol butyl ether - EGBE	111-76-2	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol ethyl ether - EGEE	110-80-5	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol ethyl ether acetate - EGEEA	111-15-9	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol methyl ether - EGME	109-86-4	6/12/1996
1,6-hexamethylene diisocyanate (monomer)	822-06-0	9/29/2020
Hydrochloric acid (hydrogen chloride)	7647-01-0	6/12/1996
Hydrogen selenide	7783-07-5	6/12/1996
Hydrogen sulfide	7783-06-4	6/12/1996
Isopropyl alcohol (isopropanol)	67-63-0	1/11/2001
Mercury (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7439-97-6	6/12/1996
Mercuric chloride	7487-94-7	6/12/1996
Methanol	67-56-1	1/11/2001
Methyl bromide (bromomethane)	74-83-9	6/12/1996
Methyl chloroform (1,1,1-trichloroethane)	71-55-6	6/12/1996
Methyl ethyl ketone (2-butanone)	78-93-3	1/11/2001
Methylene chloride (dichloromethane)	75-09-2	6/12/1996
Methylene diphenyl diisocyanate (Polymeric)	101-68-8	6/14/2016



**Table III - continued**  
**Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Acute Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Nickel and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-02-0	6/12/1996
Nickel acetate	373-02-4	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonate	3333-67-3	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonyl	13463-39-3	6/12/1996
Nickel hydroxide	12054-48-7	6/12/1996
Nickelocene	1271-28-9	6/12/1996
Nickel oxide	1313-99-1	6/12/1996
Nickel refinery dust from the pyrometallurgical process	1146	6/12/1996
Nickel subsulfide	12035-72-2	6/12/1996
Nitric acid	7697-37-2	1/11/2001
Nitrogen dioxide	10102-44-0	6/12/1996
Ozone	10028-15-6	6/12/1996
Perchloroethylene (tetrachloroethylene)	127-18-4	6/12/1996
Phenol	108-95-2	1/11/2001
Phosgene	75-44-5	6/12/1996
Propylene oxide	75-56-9	6/12/1996
Sodium hydroxide	1310-73-2	6/12/1996
Styrene	100-42-5	1/11/2001
Sulfates	9960	6/12/1996
Sulfur dioxide	7446-09-5	6/12/1996
Sulfuric acid and oleum	N/A	6/12/1996
Sulfuric acid	7664-93-9	6/12/1996
Sulfur trioxide	7446-71-9	6/12/1996
Oleum	8014-95-7	6/12/1996
Toluene	108-88-3	1/11/2001
Toluene diisocyanates	26471-62-5	6/14/2016
Toluene-2,4-diisocyanate	584-84-9	6/14/2016
Toluene-2,6-diisocyanate	91-08-7	6/14/2016
Triethylamine	121-44-8	1/11/2001
Vanadium (fume or dust)	7440-62-2	1/11/2001
Vanadium pentoxide	1314-62-1	1/11/2001
Vinyl chloride (chloroethylene)	75-01-4	1/11/2001
Xylenes (mixed isomers)	1330-20-7	6/12/1996
m-Xylene	108-38-3	6/12/1996
o-Xylene	95-47-6	6/12/1996
p-Xylene	106-42-3	6/12/1996

- a. Reference Exposure Levels (RELs) and toxic endpoint information shall be obtained from any health risk assessment guidelines adopted by OEHHA. Table III was last revised pursuant to Rule 1200(c)(23) on 9/29/20 and Rule 1210(c)(23) on *(date of adoption)*.
- b. Chemical Abstract Service Number (CAS): For chemical groupings and mixtures where a CAS number is not applicable, the 4-digit code used in the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Emission Inventory Criteria and Guidelines (EICG) Report is listed. For information on the origin and use of the 4-digit code, see the EICG report.

**IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED AND ORDERED** that proposed amended Rule 1210 of Regulation XII shall take effect *(date of adoption)*.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Air Pollution Control Governing Board of the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District, State of California, this 4th day of November 2021, by the following votes:

AYES: Bush, Elo-Rivera, Fletcher, Gomez, Medina, Sanchez, Shu, Vargas

ABSENT: Birkbeck-Garcia, Martinez, Whitburn

- - -

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)  
County of San Diego)<sup>SS</sup>

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the Original Resolution entered in the Minutes of the Board of Supervisors.



MARVICE MAZYCK  
Clerk of the Air Pollution Control District Governing Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY  
COUNTY COUNSEL

BY: Rodney Lorang, Senior Deputy

**Background of Proposed Amended Rule 1210  
(Toxic Air Contaminant Public Health Risks – Public Notification and Risk Reduction)**

The California Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Information and Assessment Act (Hot Spots Act), Assembly Bill 2588, was enacted in 1987 to address public concerns over toxic air contaminant emissions. The Hot Spots Act was amended in 1992 to require that the owners of “significant risk” facilities reduce their risks below the level of significance (which is set by each air district in California and is reflected in their individually adopted risk reduction thresholds). The Hot Spots Act requires local air pollution control districts to evaluate toxic air contaminant emissions from various businesses and determine which emissions present public health concerns. Facilities posing potential health risks above the district significance thresholds are required to develop and implement strategies to reduce those risks. The Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program (Hot Spots Program) is implemented by the local air pollution control districts using guidance developed by the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, and the California Air Resources Board.

Under the Hot Spots Program, facilities emitting toxic air contaminants are required to provide the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (District) with information to update the facilities’ toxic air contaminant emissions inventories at least once every four years. The District then reviews and verifies data submitted by facilities and compiles an inventory of emissions.

Rule 1210, adopted in 1996 to implement the Hot Spots Act, establishes thresholds and procedures for public notification and risk reduction. Rule 1210 regulates facilities for four types of public health risks: 1) cancer risk, 2) cancer burden, 3) chronic (long term) noncancer risk, and 4) acute (short term) noncancer risk.

- **Cancer risk** is a calculation of the probability that a person would develop cancer if exposed to a stationary source’s emissions for 30 years, assuming that the emissions remain constant over that time period. It is expressed as the number of chances in one million of developing cancer. For example, a cancer risk of 100 in one million represents the probability that a person might develop cancer due to exposure to the facility’s emissions, but it does not mean that if one million people were exposed to that risk level, that 100 people would necessarily develop cancer. Currently, Rule 1210 requires public notification when the cancer risk from the stationary source is equal to or greater than 10 in one million, and cancer risk reduction when the risk is equal to or greater than 100 in one million. Risk reduction generally entails reducing or controlling emissions of toxic air contaminants in order to reduce public exposure to them.
- **Total Acute and Chronic Noncancer Health Hazard Indices.** The noncancer health hazard index is calculated by dividing the estimated level of exposure to chemicals emitted from a stationary source to the level of exposure that is not expected to cause any adverse health effects. If the hazard index is below one, then the estimated level of exposure is not likely to result in adverse health effects for anyone, including sensitive individuals such as children and the elderly. A hazard index of equal to or greater than one indicates that there may be greater potential for adverse health impacts from exposure to the toxic air contaminants of concern. A hazard index is calculated for both acute (short-term or one

hour) and chronic (long-term, lasting years to a lifetime) exposures to air toxic contaminants from stationary sources. Rule 1210 requires public notification and risk reduction when any of the noncancer health hazard indices is equal to or greater than 1.

- **Cancer burden** estimates the number of potential excess cancer cases within the population that would be exposed to the toxic emissions for a lifetime (70 years). The cancer burden is calculated on the basis of lifetime (70-year) risks (whereas individual cancer risk is based on 30-year residential exposure). District Rule 1210 requires public notification and risk reduction when the cancer burden is equal to or greater than 1.<sup>1</sup>

Facilities that emit toxic air contaminants in amounts potentially posing a public health risk must submit a site-specific health risk assessment (HRA) to the District. The HRA examines the possible public health risks posed to the surrounding community that could be exposed to health risks at or above the significant risk thresholds. The HRA incorporates pollutant dispersion estimates, human exposure assumptions and health effects information. Each HRA is reviewed by the District and OEHHA to verify it is conducted in accordance with applicable regulations and established procedures.

Once an HRA has been approved, Rule 1210 requires public notification to all persons in the affected area if the facility-wide cancer risk is equal to or greater than 10 in one million. In addition, those facilities with significant cancer risks equal to or greater than 100 in one million are also required to reduce those risks within five years, under the current version of Rule 1210. However, the existing cancer risk reduction threshold of 100 in one million is ineffective since there are no facilities in San Diego County that create a cancer risk above that threshold.

Based on vast scientific data established by OEHHA, whose mission is to protect human health and the environment through scientific evaluation of risks posed by hazardous substances, the toxic air contaminants emitted by the facilities subject to Rule 1210 can contribute to an increased cancer risk in the region. The proposed amended rule can bring health benefits by reducing cancer risks from toxic emissions from facilities subject to the rule.

On May 22, 2019, in an effort to better protect public health, the former San Diego County Air Pollution Control Board (Board) directed the District to: 1) evaluate the cancer risk significance threshold of Rule 1210; 2) implement a regulatory process to amend Rule 1210, including obtaining input from the public and affected businesses, and 3) return to the Board with a proposed rule.

The District conducted two public workshops on August 15, 2019 and January 30, 2020 to discuss draft rule amendments proposed at that time. The District received comments at, and subsequent to, the public workshops, and prepared responses in two workshop reports.

On March 11, 2020, the District Advisory Committee (under the former Board) was asked to consider supporting the proposed amendments to Rule 1210, reflecting a proposed lowering of the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million. The Advisory Committee voted to support aspirations to lower the cancer risk reduction threshold and reduce

---

<sup>1</sup> San Diego County Air Pollution Control District, 2019 & 2020 Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Annual Report

toxic air contaminant emissions. However, it found that additional data was needed in order to substantiate a specific threshold, and therefore, it recommended that the District conduct further analyses of the costs and benefits of different threshold levels based on the most recent emissions inventories and return to the former Board with proposed amendments to Rule 1210 in approximately one year.

On July 8, 2020, the District returned to the former Board and was given an 18-month extension to conduct additional analysis and was directed to provide progress reports every six months regarding the development of an amended rule.

The District conducted a public workshop via webinar on August 5, 2021, to discuss draft rule amendments proposed at that time. In consideration of the comments received at the workshop, the District is proposing additional amendments and clarifications to proposed amended Rule 1210. The District received comments at, and subsequent to, this public workshop, and prepared responses in a workshop report (Attachment E).

After conducting extensive evaluation and considering input from stakeholders, the District is proposing the following amendments to improve public health by reducing the cancer health risk in San Diego County: 1) lower the significant risk threshold for cancer from 100 in one million to 10 in one million; 2) enhance the public notification protocols and public meeting requirements; and 3) consider providing additional time for facilities where it is not feasible to reduce health risks within a 5-year timeframe. Proposed amended Rule 1210 may potentially affect up to 26 facilities in San Diego County classified as being in various sectors, including shipbuilding, mineral processing, and landfills.

The enhanced public notification protocols and public meeting requirements proposed in amended Rule 1210 include the following:

- Require that all initial public notifications contain clear and readable maps with isopleths.
- Require proof of distribution of public notification materials by a specified timeframe.
- Require that a public meeting be conducted for all initial public notifications, and for subsequent biennial notifications as determined and requested by the Air Pollution Control Officer.
- Require the Air Pollution Control Officer to provide a public notice within 30 days of receipt of risk reduction audit and plan and any extension request and make each document available for public review with a 30-day public comment period.
- Require the Air Pollution Control Officer to conduct a public meeting to discuss any proposed extension requests and obtain input from the public.

In order to address situations where it is not feasible for a facility to reduce health risks within a 5-year timeframe, the proposed amendments to Rule 1210 include a provision for a 3-year extension to reduce the cancer risk to below the proposed cancer risk reduction threshold. The

extension may be granted provided that the facility has installed Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT) within the 5-year timeframe. The proposed amendments also provide the potential for additional 3-year extensions provided all technically feasible control measures have been implemented. As noted above, the proposed amendments include a requirement for a public meeting prior to granting any extension. This requirement will promote a transparent process by providing the District an opportunity to present its preliminary decision regarding the extension and solicit input from the public and other stakeholders.

The proposed amendments to Rule 1210 are necessary in order to establish an effective health protective threshold to the greatest extent feasible that brings benefits to the region and to align the risk reduction and public notification thresholds.

### **Socioeconomic Impact Assessment**

State law requires the District to perform an assessment of the socioeconomic impacts when adopting, amending, or repealing a rule that will significantly affect air quality or emission limitations. A review conducted by District staff found that proposed amended Rule 1210 will not significantly affect air quality or emission limitations, and therefore a Socioeconomic Impact Assessment (SIA) is not required for this proposal per State law. However, an SIA (Attachment C) has been prepared to provide additional analysis for the proposed amended rule.

While the proposed amended rule will require that estimated cancer risk be reduced to below 10 in one million, the rule does not prescribe which risk reduction measures are to be implemented. A facility has various ways to reduce its risk, including but not limited to, installing emissions control equipment, reducing emissions, changing exhaust stack parameters to better disperse pollutants, relocating equipment away from people, and employing alternate processes that have fewer air pollutant emissions. The District determined low-cost and high-cost scenarios by assuming each affected facility within an industry type will install the same type of emissions control equipment or implement the same control measure currently available. The average annual compliance costs due to proposed amended Rule 1210 is estimated to be \$10 to \$16 million for the low-cost and high-cost scenario, respectively. The sectors of shipbuilding and mineral processing will incur the majority share of the estimated total annualized cost. Affected facilities will be required to submit a risk reduction audit and plan, for evaluation and approval by the Air Pollution Control Officer, and to reduce the cancer risk to below the proposed cancer risk reduction threshold.

To project the job impacts resulting from adopting the proposed amended Rule 1210, staff used a regional economic model built for the San Diego economy (IMPLAN Model). Based on this model, the proposed amended rule is expected to result in a net change of approximately 61 jobs forgone annually between the years 2022 and 2032. The projected job impacts represent about 0.003% of the total employment in San Diego County (about 2.2 million jobs) and assumes the high average annual compliance cost scenario of \$16 million. The projected net change of 61 jobs forgone stems from additional compliance costs in the sectors of university, shipbuilding, and other concrete product manufacturing sectors and accounts for some job gains in the sectors of construction and manufacturing due to additional local spending associated with implementing risk reduction measures.

On the other hand, mitigating levels of air toxics can serve to reduce the inhalation or non-inhalation dose a resident or worker experiences, thus reducing excess estimated cancer risk. Although monetary benefits of reducing estimated cancer risks have not been specifically quantified, the value of morbidity incidence results from four components: 1) costs to reduce the risk of illness, 2) costs for treatments such as medical care and medication, 3) costs due to lost time from paid work or maintaining a home, and 4) costs resulting from pain and suffering.

**SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**PROPOSED AMENDED RULE 1210 –  
TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS-  
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION**

**October 2021**

**Prepared by**

**San Diego County Air Pollution Control District  
10124 Old Grove Road  
San Diego, CA 92131**



**SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT**  
**PROPOSED AMENDED RULE 1210 –**  
**TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS –**  
**PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
I. INTRODUCTION	7
II. NECESSITY OF PROPOSED AMENDED RULE 1210	7
III. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDED RULE 1210	9
IV. TYPE OF INDUSTRIES AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED AMENDED RULE	10
V. RANGE OF PROBABLE COSTS TO INDUSTRY INCLUDING SMALL BUSINESSES	11
VI. AVAILABILITY OF ALTERNATIVES	13
VII. EMISSION REDUCTION POTENTIAL AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDED RULE	14
VIII. IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDED RULE ON EMPLOYMENT AND THE REGIONAL ECONOMY	15
IX. CONCLUSION	22
APPENDICES	24
Appendix A - List of Facilities Potentially Affected by Proposed Amended Rule 1210	24
Appendix B - Other Socioeconomic Impacts in San Diego County	26

## LIST OF TABLES

		<u>PAGE</u>
Table 1	Summary of Industry Sources	10
Table 2	Projected Compliance Costs by Industry Due to Additional Pollution Controls or Control Measures (2020 Dollars)	12
Table 3	A Snapshot of the San Diego County Economy	16
Table 4	San Diego County Top Ten Industries (2019)	17
Table 5	Industries Incurring vs. Benefitting from Compliance Costs/Spending	20
Table 6	Economic Impact of Proposed Amended Rule 1210	21
Table 7	Top Five Employment Industries	21
Table 8	Top Five Output Industries	22

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Socioeconomic Impact Assessment (SIA) has been prepared to assess the impacts of proposed amended Rule 1210 –Toxic Air Contaminant Public Health Risks-Public Notification and Risk Reduction. A summary of the analysis and findings is presented below.

<p><b>Elements of Proposed Amended Rule</b></p>	<p>The purpose of proposed amended Rule 1210 is to protect public health by lowering the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million and to align with the public notification threshold. In an effort to minimize the public’s exposure to potential toxic air contaminants, proposed amended Rule 1210 will require affected facilities to reduce their estimated cancer risk to below the proposed 10 in one million threshold within a 5-year timeframe. However, some facilities may need additional time to reduce the estimated cancer risk to below 10 in one million due to the need for future technological advancements. Thus, the proposed amended rule includes provisions for an extension period for situations when reducing the cancer risk is not technically feasible. A 3-year extension may be granted provided that the facility has installed Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT) on all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s). Subsequent extensions may be granted provided that the facility has further installed all technically feasible controls on all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s).</p> <p>In addition, proposed amended Rule 1210 will make some changes to the provisions of Rule 1210 to: 1) require that all initial public notifications contain clear and readable maps with isopleths; 2) require proof of distribution of public notification materials by a certain timeframe; 3) require that a public meeting be conducted for all initial public notifications, and for subsequent biennial notifications as determined and requested by the Air Pollution Control Officer; 4) specify that the risk reduction requirements shall apply to health risk assessments conducted for emissions inventory years 2018 and later with an estimated cancer risk equal to or greater than 10 in one million; 5) specify that the risk reduction requirements shall apply to health risk assessments conducted for emissions inventory years prior to 2018 with an estimated cancer risk equal to or greater than 100 in one million; 6) require the Air Pollution Control Officer to provide a public notice within 30 days of receipt of risk reduction audit and plan and any extension request, and make each document available for public review with a 30-day public comment period; 7) include a provision for a 3-year extension to reduce the estimated cancer risks to below the proposed cancer risk reduction threshold provided that the facility has installed Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT); 8) provide for additional 3-year extension options to reduce the estimated cancer risk to below the proposed cancer risk reduction threshold provided all further additional technically feasible controls besides T-BARCT have been implemented; and 9) require</p>
---	--

	the Air Pollution Control Officer to conduct a public meeting to discuss any proposed extension requests and obtain input from the public.
<b>Affected Facilities and Industries</b>	Proposed amended Rule 1210 may potentially affect up to 26 facilities in San Diego County classified as being in various sectors, including shipbuilding, mineral processing, and landfills.
<b>Major Assumptions and Limitation of Analysis</b>	<p>The main requirements of proposed amended Rule 1210 that have major cost impacts would include the installation of emissions control equipment, e.g., baghouses and HEPA filters, and oxidation catalysts. While the proposed amended rule will require that estimated cancer risk be reduced to below 10 in one million, the rule does not prescribe which risk reduction measures are to be implemented. Affected facilities will be required to submit a risk reduction audit and plan for evaluation and approval by the Air Pollution Control Officer.</p> <p>To determine low-cost and high-cost scenarios, the District assumed each affected facility within an industry type will install the same type of emissions control equipment or implement the same control measure currently available. Based on the number of emission sources located at each facility, the total capital and annual operation and maintenance costs were estimated for each affected industry type.</p> <p>The total annualized cost estimates include annualized capital cost (4% interest, 10 years), and annual operating and maintenance costs (15% of total capital cost if annual cost estimates are not available). All costs are expressed in 2020 dollars.</p> <p>The annual compliance costs are assumed to start in 2022 after the adoption of proposed amended Rule 1210. However, due to the process of public notification, submission of a risk reduction audit and plan, public participation, evaluation and approval by the Air Pollution Control Officer, and implementation of the risk reduction measures outlined in the plan, annual compliance costs may occur after 2022.</p>
<b>Annualized Compliance Costs</b>	The average annual compliance costs for all affected sources due to proposed amended Rule 1210 is estimated to be \$10 to \$16 million for the low-cost and high-cost scenario, respectively. The sectors of shipbuilding and mineral processing will incur the majority share of the estimated total annualized cost.
<b>Quantifying Health Benefits</b>	The monetary benefits of decreased mortality risk and morbidity from reduced cancer incidence can potentially be calculated for populations impacted by air toxics. In terms of the reduction of mortalities, a measure such as the value of a statistical life (VSL) can be used to assign monetary values to reductions in the estimated cancer risk posed to a population. VSL is defined as the additional cost that individuals would be willing to bear for reductions in risk that, in the aggregate, reduce the expected number of fatalities by one.

	<p>Currently, none of the California air districts have officially quantified the monetary benefits of reducing cancer risks from their toxic rules. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has currently engaged in a contract with the University of California, Davis to develop such a methodology.</p>
<p><b>Regional Job Impacts</b></p>	<p>The total economic impacts resulting from proposed amended Rule 1210 were determined with an input-output model that estimates purchases and sales between the various sectors of the economy. The model incorporates multipliers and data tables specific to San Diego County (the latest San Diego County IMPLAN Model) and generates impact estimates for separate components of the quantified benefits in terms of employment, labor income, value added, and output.</p> <p>Proposed amended Rule 1210 is expected to result in approximately 61 jobs forgone annually between 2022 and 2032 when a 4% real interest rate is assumed. The projected job impacts represent about 0.003% of the total employment in San Diego County. The university, shipbuilding, and other concrete product manufacturing sectors are expected to lose about 25, 22, and 19 jobs annually, respectively. On the other hand, construction and air and gas manufacturing are expected to gain few jobs due to additional spending in these sectors.</p>

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

California law requires air pollution control districts (with populations of 500,000 people or higher) to perform a Socioeconomic Impact Assessment (SIA) when adopting, amending, or repealing rules and regulations that will significantly affect air quality and emissions limitations. While an SIA is not required for this proposal per State law because proposed amended Rule 1210 does not directly affect emissions limitations, this SIA has been prepared to provide additional analysis for the proposed amended rule.

The Health and Safety Code Section 40728.5 specifies the following elements to be included in the SIA:

1. The type of industry or business, including small business, affected by the rule or regulation.
2. The impact of the rule or regulation on employment and the economy of the region affected by the adoption of the rule or regulation.
3. The range of probable costs to industry or business, including small business, of the rule or regulation.
4. The availability and cost-effectiveness of alternatives to the rule or regulation.
5. The emission reduction potential of the rule or regulation.
6. The necessity of adopting, amending, or repealing the rule or regulation in order to attain state and federal ambient air quality standards.

## **II. NECESSITY OF PROPOSED AMENDED RULE 1210**

While the overall industrial toxic emissions have been regulated and/or incentives provided to result in their decline in San Diego County since existing Rule 1210 was adopted, there is still a public risk of developing cancer due to the total amount of toxic air contaminants emitted by these individual stationary sources. That is, certain facilities still pose an increased estimated cancer risk to the surrounding communities. The scientific knowledge and understanding continues to develop about the effects of toxic air contaminants on the human body. As such, in 2015, the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) refined its methodology by incorporating the latest science in toxics exposure duration, age-based sensitivity factors, and the varying breathing rates of different age groups. These changes may result in estimates of higher risks for facilities than previously calculated, even if a facility's emissions and other conditions have remained unchanged, as the updated risk calculation methodologies consider the latest health science and aforementioned factors.

On May 22, 2019, in an effort to better protect and improve public health, the former San Diego County Air Pollution Control Board (Board) directed the District to evaluate the current cancer risk reduction threshold in Rule 1210 (100 in one million), implement a regulatory process to

analyze the cancer risk reduction threshold, including obtaining input from the public and affected businesses, and then return to the Board with a proposed rule.

The District is proposing to lower the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million for the following reasons:

1. Establish a health protective limit. Given the scientific data established by OEHHA, which demonstrates the contaminants emitted by the facilities subject to this amendment create an increased cancer risk, the District has a responsibility to require cancer risk reductions to the extent it is feasible. The rule, as proposed, allows for extensions when it is not feasible to reduce the cancer risk to below the significant risk thresholds. The District must consider extensions because for some industries, technology is not feasible and is still advancing.
2. Align the cancer risk notification threshold, which is currently 10 in one million, with the cancer risk reduction threshold. It's unacceptable to provide notification to the public about elevated health risks and at the same time inform them that the facility is not required to reduce the health risk when feasible.
3. Make the cancer risk reduction threshold consistent with 11 other California air districts that have already implemented a 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold. California has a total of 35 local air districts and out of these 35, the top five largest districts include: San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD), San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Valley Air District), South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD), Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (Sac Air Quality). Out of the top 5 largest districts, SDAPCD and the Valley Air District are the only districts that have a 100 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold. South Coast AQMD has a 25 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold and Sac Air Quality and BAAQMD have a 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold.
4. The District has carefully evaluated the impact of this proposal on the facilities under its jurisdiction (in San Diego County). Specifically, the District has quantified the toxic air contaminant emissions from all facilities subject to the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program through the 2019 calendar year. The District has also identified the facilities that might create elevated health risks and required health risk assessments, which quantify the health risks. In accordance with State law, health risk assessments are conducted by the facilities, reviewed by OEHHA, and approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer. Under this evaluation, the District identified up to 26 facilities that may be subject to the proposed change in the cancer risk reduction threshold (see Appendix A – List of Facilities Potentially Affected by Proposed Amended Rule 1210).

For context, the District evaluated a total of approximately 400 facilities under its jurisdiction and, out of the 400 facilities evaluated, it identified up to 26 facilities that may be affected by this proposal. Based on the nature of the facilities identified, it is feasible for most of them to reduce estimated cancer risks to below the 10 in one million cancer risk threshold within a 5-year period. Some facilities might need additional time to reduce the estimated

cancer risk to below 10 in one million due to future technological advancements, which is why the proposed rule has provisions for extensions when reducing the cancer risk is not feasible. The proposed 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold is appropriate when compared to other potential cancer risk reduction thresholds (refer to Section VI - Availability and Cost-Effectiveness of Alternatives).

For the 5 health risk assessments for the 2013 calendar year, which have been approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer, to date there are over 5,000 residential and school addresses, schools, and other entities that will require public notification regarding a facility's estimated cancer risk. The number of addresses and other entities to be notified will likely increase as more health risk assessments are approved. The proposed amended rule will consequently require substantial public notification and provide corresponding public health benefits due to the requirement for facilities to further reduce their estimated cancer risk.

Proposed amended Rule 1210 is designed to fulfill the former Board direction to evaluate the previous cancer risk reduction threshold, and to further reduce the health risk associated with public exposure to emissions of toxic air contaminants.

### **III. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDED RULE 1210**

In summary, the proposed amendments will make some changes to the provisions of Rule 1210 to:

- Lower the cancer risk reduction threshold to below 10 in one million.
- Require that all public notifications contain clear and readable maps with isopleths.
- Require proof of distribution of public notification materials by a certain timeframe.
- Require that a public meeting be conducted for all initial public notifications, and for subsequent biennial notifications as determined and requested by the Air Pollution Control Officer.
- Specify that the risk reduction requirements shall apply to health risk assessments conducted for emissions inventory years 2018 and later with an estimated cancer risk equal to or greater than 10 in one million.
- Specify that the risk reduction requirements shall apply to health risk assessments conducted for emissions inventory years prior to 2018 with an estimated cancer risk equal to or greater than 100 in one million.
- Require the Air Pollution Control Officer to provide a public notice within 30 days of receipt of risk reduction audit and plan and any extension request and make each document available for public review with a 30-day public comment period.
- Include a provision for a 3-year extension to reduce the estimated cancer risks to below the proposed cancer risk reduction threshold provided that the facility has installed Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT).
- Provide for additional 3-year extension options to reduce the estimated cancer risk to below the proposed cancer risk reduction threshold provided all further additional technically feasible controls besides T-BARCT have been implemented.



- Require the Air Pollution Control Officer to conduct a public meeting to discuss any proposed extension requests and obtain input from the public.
- Update and remove outdated language.
- Include other minor edits for clarification.

#### IV. TYPE OF INDUSTRIES AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED AMENDED RULE

Proposed amended Rule 1210 may affect various industrial sectors in San Diego County. As the proposed amended rule affects a wide spectrum of San Diego County’s local economy, this SIA groups the affected facilities into several industry categories. Table 1 - Summary of Industry Sources below lists potentially impacted industries with potential emissions control equipment or control measures, and primary risk drivers.

**Table 1 – Summary of Industry Sources**

Industry Type	Number of Facilities	Number of Emission Sources	Control Equipment or Control Measure	Primary Risk Driver(s)
Landfills	4	4	(More Frequent Watering, Soil Stabilizers) Paving Haul Roads <sup>1</sup>	Arsenic Diesel PM Benzene Acrylonitrile
Mineral Processing	9	9	Baghouse	Arsenic Diesel PM Hexavalent Chromium
Power Generation	4	15	Oxidation Catalyst Carbon Adsorption	Acrylonitrile Vinyl Chloride Formaldehyde
Shipbuilding	3	30 12	HEPA Filter System Replacement Crane Engine <sup>2</sup>	Diesel PM Hexavalent Chromium Ethylbenzene Cadmium
Sewage Treatment Facilities	1	1	Oxidation Catalyst Thermal Oxidizer	1,2-Dichloroethane PAH Diesel PM Formaldehyde
Turbine Repair and Testing	1	1	Oxidation Catalyst	Formaldehyde
Hospitals University Scientific Research (all with diesel engines)	2 1 1	9 18 4	Diesel Particulate Filter <sup>3</sup> Oxidation Catalyst	Diesel PM
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>			

<sup>1</sup> HomeAdvisor, Asphalt Driveway Cost, <https://www.homeadvisor.com/cost/outdoor-living/install-asphalt-paving/>

<sup>2</sup> California Air Resources Board, Amendments to the Regulation for Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment at Ports and Intermodal Rail Yards, Staff Report, Appendix C, August 2011

<sup>3</sup> Discussion with South Coast AQMD staff

## **V. RANGE OF PROBABLE COSTS TO INDUSTRY INCLUDING SMALL BUSINESSES**

The total costs of the proposed amended rule are uncertain because actions taken by affected facilities will depend on the risk reduction measures proposed by the facilities, e.g., facilities may propose to install control devices, implement alternative technologies and processes, relocate certain operations, increase release heights for better dispersion, or reduce operating hours or throughput.

To determine low-cost and high-cost scenarios, the District assumed each affected facility within an industry type will install the same type of emissions control equipment or implement the same control measure currently available. Based on the number of emission sources located at each facility, the total capital and annual operation and maintenance costs were estimated for each affected industry type.

The total annualized cost estimates include annualized capital cost (4% interest, 10 years), and annual operating and maintenance costs (15% of total capital cost if annual cost estimates are not available). All costs discussed in this section are expressed in 2020 dollars.

The annual compliance costs are assumed to start in 2022 after the adoption of proposed amended Rule 1210. However, due to the process of public notification, submission of a risk reduction audit and plan, public participation, evaluation and approval by the Air Pollution Control Officer, and implementation of the risk reduction measures outlined in the plan, annual compliance costs may occur after 2022.

Table 2 - Projected Compliance Costs by Industry Due to Additional Pollution Controls or Control Measures (2020 Dollars) presents the low-cost and high-cost scenario estimates by industry type. The sectors of shipbuilding and mineral processing will incur the majority share of the estimated total annualized cost. The District anticipates that some facilities may elect to implement no-cost or low-cost risk reduction measures such as more frequent watering or application of soil stabilizers to the haul roads, operating time restrictions, process improvements, relocation of the emission unit, or stack height increase.

**Table 2 - Projected Compliance Costs by Industry Due to Additional Pollution Controls or Control Measures (2020 Dollars)**

Industry Type	NAICS Codes	Number of Facilities	Projected Increase in Compliance Costs <sup>4, 5</sup>			
			Total Capital Cost Low-Cost Scenario	Total Capital Cost High-Cost Scenario	Total Annualized Cost (per year) Low-Cost Scenario	Total Annualized Cost (per year) High-Cost Scenario
Landfills	56222	4	\$443,520	\$823,680	\$54,682	\$101,552
Mineral Processing	327992	9	\$2,304,000	\$3,879,360	\$2,759,062	\$3,701,230
Power Generation	22111	4	\$10,619,400	\$17,880,415	\$1,599,736	\$2,582,730
Shipbuilding	336611	3	\$12,240,000	\$22,445,100	\$3,497,811	\$6,181,833
Sewage Treatment	221320	1	\$630,960	\$1,062,379	\$89,042	\$145,631
Turbine Repair	333611	1	\$514,360	\$866,054	\$63,416	\$106,777
Hospitals	622110	2	\$4,674,240	\$7,866,483	\$576,291	\$969,866
University	611310	1	\$9,348,480	\$15,732,966	\$1,152,583	\$1,939,732
Scientific Research	5417	1	\$2,077,440	\$3,496,215	\$256,130	\$431,052
<b>Total</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>\$42,852,400</b>	<b>\$74,052,650</b>	<b>\$10,048,753</b>	<b>\$16,160,402</b>

**Small Businesses**

Historically, for purposes of SIAs, the District has defined a small business as an entity that meets all of the following conditions:

1. The business is independently owned and operated. (California Government Code, Section 11342.610, Small Business definition)
2. The business is not dominant in its field of operation. (Same)

<sup>4</sup> South Coast AQMD, Socioeconomic Report, Rules 307.1, 1401, 1402, September 2016

<sup>5</sup> South Coast AQMD, Socioeconomic Report, Rule 1407 - Control of Emissions of Arsenic, Cadmium, and Nickel from Non-Chromium Metal Melting Operations, September 2019

3. The business has gross annual receipts not more than \$500,000. (South Coast AQMD), Rule 102 – Definition of Terms)
4. The business employs ten persons or less. (South Coast AQMD Rule 102)
5. The business has total annual VOC emissions less than 10 tons. (Health and Safety Code, Section 42323, Small Stationary Source)

According to the District’s permit files and information obtained from the California Employment Development Department, none of the potential 26 facilities that may be affected by the proposed amended rule meet all the aforementioned conditions.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, proposed amended Rule 1210 will not have a negative economic impact on small businesses in San Diego County.

## **VI. AVAILABILITY OF ALTERNATIVES**

The District evaluated four potential options for determining the cancer risk reduction threshold in the proposed amended rule, which are presented below:

### **Option 1 - Lower threshold to 10 in one million**

Lowering the significant risk threshold to 10 in one million may apply to 26 facilities. The District is proposing a cancer risk reduction threshold of 10 in one million because it will reduce the estimated cancer risk to the greatest extent feasible, and for the reasons specified in Section II – Necessity of Proposed Amended Rule 1210 of this SIA.

### **Option 2 - Lower threshold to 25 in one million**

Lowering the significant risk threshold to 25 in one million would not bring significant benefits since it would only apply to 4 facilities, based on current data and assuming the health risk assessments submitted to the District are approved without revisions. Also, the District would miss an opportunity to reduce cancer risk as it is technically feasible for other facilities with an estimated cancer risk above 10 in one million and below 25 in one million to reduce their cancer risks.

### **Option 3 - Lower threshold to 50 in one million**

Lowering the significant risk threshold to 50 in one million would not bring significant benefits since it would only apply to 2 facilities, based on current data and assuming the health risk Assessments submitted to the District are approved without revisions. Also, the District would miss an opportunity to reduce estimated cancer risk as it is technically feasible for other facilities with an estimated cancer risk below 50 in one million to reduce their cancer risks.

---

<sup>6</sup> California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information, <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov>

#### **Option 4 - Retain existing threshold of 100 in one million**

The 100 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold for risk reduction requirements specified in existing Rule 1210 is ineffective since it does not apply to any facilities regulated by the District. No facilities in San Diego County currently exceed the 100 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold. If this existing threshold is retained, no facility will be subject to risk reduction requirements, and no additional public health protection will be provided by this cancer risk threshold. In fact, since Rule 1210 was adopted in 1996, only 2 facilities have been subject to risk reduction requirements based on elevated cancer risk (i.e., cancer risk equal to or above 100 in one million). Thus, the existing threshold has not resulted in substantial cancer risk reduction in the region in the 25 years since its adoption.

#### **VII. EMISSION REDUCTION POTENTIAL AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDED RULE**

The District cannot predetermine what risk reduction measures may be implemented at each facility that would potentially be affected by the proposed amended rule. Also, some risk reduction measures, such as increased stack height or relocating a point source further away from receptors, would not result in any emission reductions.

In addition, toxic emission rules, such as proposed amended Rule 1210, don't lend themselves to the typical cost-effectiveness analysis used for criteria pollutants such as ozone precursors because doing so would necessarily require the District to assign a dollar value to a potential health outcome avoided, e.g., cancer incidence or a developmental disability. Cost-effectiveness is not meaningful for risk-based regulations such as proposed amended Rule 1210 since many other factors besides the amount of pollution affect the risk such as the toxic potency and the location of receptors. Consequently, a calculation of emission reductions and cost-effectiveness, expressed in dollars per pound of emissions reduced, cannot be estimated.

The proposed amended rule will require affected facilities to reduce their potential estimated cancer risk. Facilities subject to risk reduction requirements will be required to submit an application to the Air Pollution Control Officer with a proposed plan to reduce their health risk. The proposed amended rule has provisions for an extension period provided that it is not feasible to further reduce the estimated cancer risk with current technologies. Costs associated with risk reduction measures will be considered for a 3-year extension beyond the required 5-year timeframe. Subsequent extensions may be granted provided that the risk reduction measures are not technically feasible.

#### **Quantifying Health Benefits**

Mitigating levels of air toxics can serve to reduce the inhalation or non-inhalation dose a resident or worker experiences, thus reducing excess estimated cancer risk. The reduction in excess estimated cancer risk has potentially quantifiable monetary benefits from premature deaths avoided and reduced morbidity incidence of non-fatal cancer. The value of morbidity incidence results from four components: 1) costs to reduce the risk of illness, 2) costs for treatments such as

medical care and medication, 3) costs due to lost time from paid work or maintaining a home, and 4) costs resulting from pain and suffering.

The monetary benefits of decreased mortality risk and morbidity from reduced cancer incidence can potentially be calculated for populations impacted by air toxics. In terms of the reduction of mortalities, a measure such as the value of a statistical life (VSL) can be used to assign monetary values to reductions in the estimated cancer risk posed to a population. VSL is defined as the additional cost that individuals would be willing to bear for reductions in risk that, in the aggregate, reduce the expected number of fatalities by one.<sup>7</sup>

Currently, none of the California air districts have officially quantified the monetary benefits of reducing estimated cancer risks from their toxic rules. CARB has currently engaged in a contract with the University of California, Davis to develop such a methodology.

## **VIII. IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDED RULE ON EMPLOYMENT AND THE REGIONAL ECONOMY**

### **San Diego County Economy**

According to the latest Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN) Model 2021, the total gross regional product (GRP) of San Diego County is estimated to be about \$264.6 billion. IMPLAN staff recommended the use of the 2019 IMPLAN baseline for this analysis because the economy of San Diego County is recovering from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the 2019 baseline better represents the current state of the regional economy.

Table 3 - A Snapshot of the San Diego County Economy presents a snapshot of the county's economy. The total value added is the gross regional product derived from the income paid to the owners of the factors of production in the model year. The total final demand is gross regional product derived from the sale or production value of goods and services by final users about 67% of which came from household purchases in the model year.

---

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses, EPA 240-R-00-003, 2000

**Table 3 - A Snapshot of the San Diego County Economy**

<b>Industry Description</b>	<b>Value in 2019</b>
Gross Regional Product	\$264,614,057,523
Total Personal Income	\$220,866,983,625
Total Employment	2,213,030
Number of Industries	483
Land Area (Sq. Miles)	4,204
Population	3,338,330
Total Households	1,185,342
Average Household Income	\$186,332
<b>Final Demand</b>	<b>Value in 2019</b>
Households	\$177,560,821,638
State/Local Government	\$35,807,741,435
Federal Government	\$72,423,236,830
Capital	\$38,749,750,154
Exports	\$105,379,652,059
Imports	\$153,130,311,097
Institutional Sales	\$12,176,833,496
Total Final Demand	\$264,614,057,523
<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Value in 2019</b>
Employee Compensation	\$138,552,766,471
Proprietor Income	\$16,990,869,801
Other Property Type Income	\$93,847,997,608
Indirect Business Taxes	\$15,222,423,640
Total Value Added	\$264,614,057,523

\*IMPLAN Model 2021 (San Diego County)

Table 4 - San Diego County Top Ten Industries (2019) presents the top ten industries with their corresponding employment, labor income, and output within San Diego County. Scientific research and development services business sector has the highest output followed by the military, owner-occupied dwellings, and other real estate.

**Table 4 – San Diego County Top Ten Industries (2019)**

<b>Industry Description</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Output</b>
Scientific research and development services	97,217	\$11,762,932,379	\$26,344,891,687
Employment and payroll of federal govt, military	110,277	\$10,510,391,164	\$24,000,900,815
Owner-occupied dwellings	0	\$0	\$23,821,951,863
Other real estate	93,372	\$3,756,678,895	\$21,811,125,228
Tenant-occupied housing	11,377	\$448,711,754	\$9,876,113,613
Employment and payroll of federal govt, non-military	40,140	\$5,562,149,336	\$8,861,540,314
Employment and payroll of local govt, education	76,124	\$6,570,789,335	\$7,150,961,832
Natural gas distribution	6,434	\$1,419,831,335	\$7,045,898,590
Other local government enterprises	21,447	\$2,056,252,505	\$6,430,237,417
Management of companies and enterprises	25,271	\$3,174,462,742	\$5,953,289,775

\*IMPLAN Model 2021 (San Diego County)

### **Study Approach and Model Assumptions**

IMPLAN is an economic impact assessment software system which combines a set of extensive databases concerning economic factors, multipliers and demographic statistics with a highly refined and detailed system of modeling software. IMPLAN allows the user to develop local-level input-output models that can estimate the economic impact of a policy change, in this case proposed amended Rule 1210.

For this SIA, the latest IMPLAN model built for San Diego County was used to measure the multiplier effect and determine induced impacts. This model is considered a standard method for evaluating the economic benefits of private and public facilities. The model contains a detailed database of economic multipliers used to estimate the induced impacts associated with the direct and indirect spending that occurs toward affected facilities’ operations. Economic leakage is when capital or income is used or spent outside the local area, and therefore is not included in the statewide multiplier.

The total economic impacts resulting from proposed amended Rule 1210 were determined with an input-output model that estimates purchases and sales between the various sectors of the economy. The model incorporates multipliers and data tables specific to San Diego County (IMPLAN Model 2021 San Diego County) and generates impact estimates for separate components of the quantified



benefits in terms of employment, labor income, value added, and output. Output represents the total money value of related activities supported by the base reuse spending. Value added represents money value of output minus the values of intermediate products.

Economists have developed methods to capture the interaction of an industry with the rest of the economy by quantifying its linkages to other sectors of the economy. These models attempt to determine how an expansion in one industry has ripple effects on other sectors of the economy by estimating the "direct," the "indirect," and the "induced" effects of an economic activity:

- **Direct effects** are the employment, output, and income directly lost and generated by the business activities. Direct effects of the proposed amended rule include additional costs to the affected entities and additional sales, by local vendors, of equipment, devices, or services that would meet the proposed requirements. In this analysis, these impacts are the additional compliance costs of proposed amended Rule 1210 and the benefits associated with additional capital and operating expenditures for the implementation of cancer risk reduction measures. The additional compliance costs would increase cost of doing business for the affected industries and would reduce output and employment in those sectors. On the other hand, there are benefits from additional expenditures which support employment and payroll in construction and service-related industries such as local contractor and installers of control equipment and wholesale, and retail sectors.
- **Indirect effects** are the result of the expansion of supplier industries whose products are used as inputs for the new businesses created around affected facilities. The additional cost of doing business and the contribution of the capital and operating spending for an economy goes beyond its primary direct activities; it interacts with other industries in generating products for sale or services for hire. In some cases, these secondary businesses may be direct suppliers; in others they may provide goods and services for those direct suppliers. For example, when a company orders pollution control equipment for its operations it would increase demand for local jobs and resources which helps support additional economic activity.
- **Induced effects** are the additional costs and benefits resulting from the recirculation of direct and indirect impacts within the economy. This spending multiplies until the benefits ultimately leak outside the region. These costs and spending multipliers were calculated using the IMPLAN multipliers that are specific to San Diego County. For example, as local government, new businesses, and employees experience an increase or decrease in their revenue/salary for housing, food, and services, those expenditures circulate through the economy resulting in increased or decreased spending, payroll, and employment throughout San Diego County.

The total economic impact is the sum of the direct, indirect, and induced effects. The quantitative benefits of affected facilities' spending are expressed as jobs, annual payroll, and annual output. Output can be thought of as a measure of annual economic activity or spending.

Secondary impacts are not as easily quantified as first-round impacts, so a reliable method of estimating the induced impacts must be applied. One economic impact modeling system, in use by over 1,500 public and private institutions, is the IMPLAN model and database. The IMPLAN model combines industry survey data collected periodically by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis Input-Output benchmarks with other data to produce a balanced account format recommended by the United Nations. In this context, “balanced” accounts incorporate all goods and services transactions (including imports and exports) as well as all income flows, taxes, subsidies and expenditures by all economic agents (consumers, investors and the government). In a broad sense, it is an all-encompassing snapshot of the whole economy. County-wide data are obtained by disaggregating the balanced national accounts.<sup>8</sup>

### **Jobs and Other Socioeconomic Impacts**

The assessment herein was performed relative to a baseline (“business as usual”) where the proposed amendments would not be implemented. The proposed amendments to Rule 1210 would create a policy scenario under which 26 existing facilities may incur an average annual compliance cost totaling \$10 million to \$16 million to comply with the proposed requirements. The annual compliance costs are assumed to start in 2022. For the purpose of analyzing the impacts of the worse-case scenario, staff used the total annual high costs (\$16 million) within the IMPLAN input-output model.

Direct effects of the proposed amendments have to be estimated and used as inputs to the IMPLAN model in order for the model to assess secondary and induced impacts for all the actors in the San Diego County economy on an annual basis. Direct effects of the proposed amendments include additional costs to the affected entities and additional sales, by local vendors, of equipment, devices, or services that would meet the proposed requirements. Whereas all the compliance expenditures that are incurred by the affected facilities will increase their cost of doing business, the purchase of additional pollution control equipment or control measures will increase the sales of various sectors.

Table 5 - Industries Incurring vs. Benefitting from Compliance Costs/Spending lists the sectors modeled in IMPLAN that would either incur or benefit from the compliance expenditures. It should be noted that, although staff was able to make assumptions about the geographical location of directly affected facilities based on the review of District permits, the same could not be assumed for the businesses from whom the affected facilities would purchase control equipment and services. For the purpose of this analysis, staff assumed that all the installation and maintenance of the control equipment will incur in San Diego County.

---

<sup>8</sup> Economic Impact Analysis of Alliance California and the San Bernardino International Airport (former Norton Air Force Base) Phase II (2011-2014), March 31, 2015

**Table 5 - Industries Incurring vs. Benefitting from Compliance Costs/Spending**

<b>Source of Compliance Costs</b>	<b>IMPLAN Industries Incurring Compliance Costs (3-digit NAICS)</b>	<b>IMPLAN Industries Benefitting from Compliance Spending (3-digit NAICS)</b>
Paving Haul Roads (Landfills)		<i>One-time-Capital:</i> Asphalt Paving (237)
Baghouses (Mineral Processing)		<i>One-time-Capital:</i> Industrial and Commercial Fans Manufacturing (333)
Carbon Adsorption Oxidation Catalyst (Power Generation)		<i>One-time-Capital:</i> Carbon and Graphite Product Manufacturing (335), Industrial Gas Manufacturing (325)
HEPA Filter Systems Replacement Cranes (Shipbuilding)		<i>One-time-Capital:</i> Industrial and Commercial Fans Manufacturing (333), Construction Machinery Manufacturing (333)
Oxidation Catalyst Thermal Oxidizer (Sewage Treatment)		<i>One-time-Capital:</i> Industrial Gas Manufacturing (325), Power Boiler and Heat Exchanger Manufacturing (332)
Oxidation Catalyst (Turbine Repair)		<i>One-time-Capital:</i> Industrial Gas Manufacturing (325)
Diesel Particulate Filter Oxidation Catalyst (Various with Diesel Engines)		<i>One-time-Capital:</i> Other Engine Equipment Manufacturing (333), Industrial Gas Manufacturing (325)
		<i>Installation Spending:</i> Construction (236)

As presented in Table 6 - Economic Impact of Proposed Amended Rule 1210, the proposed amended rule is expected to result in a total of 61 jobs forgone annually with a total reduction of \$3 million in annual labor income, and \$1.6 million reduction in annual output.

**Table 6 – Economic Impact of Proposed Amended Rule 1210**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	(42.86)	\$(2,175,689)	\$(1,300,486)	\$1,033,989
Indirect Effect	(7.41)	\$(330,385)	\$(456,108)	\$(855,866)
Induced Effect	(10.78)	\$(577,154)	\$(1,130,403)	\$(1,804,326)
<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>(61.06)</b>	<b>\$(3,083,229)</b>	<b>\$(2,886,998)</b>	<b>\$(1,626,203)</b>

\*IMPLAN Model 2021 (San Diego County)

\*\*Values in parentheses are negative (typical).

As presented in the Table 7 - Top Five Employment Industries below, the university, shipbuilding, and other concrete product manufacturing sectors are expected to lose about 25, 22, and 19 jobs annually, respectively. On the other hand, construction and air and gas manufacturing are expected to gain few jobs due to additional spending in these sectors.

**Table 7 – Top Five Employment Industries**

<b>Impact Industry</b>	<b>Direct Impact Employment</b>	<b>Indirect Impact Employment</b>	<b>Induced Impact Employment</b>	<b>Total Impact Employment</b>
Junior colleges, colleges, universities, and professional schools	(24.87)	(0.12)	(0.15)	(25.15)
Shipbuilding and repairing	(21.37)	(0.09)	(0.00)	(21.45)
Other concrete product manufacturing	(18.72)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(18.72)
Construction of new manufacturing structures	8.77	0.00	0.00	8.77
Air and gas compressor manufacturing	7.83	0.00	(0.00)	7.83

\*IMPLAN Model 2021 (San Diego County)

As presented in Table 8 - Top Five Output Industries, shipbuilding and other concrete product manufacturing sectors are expected to experience a reduction in the total annual value of economic output of \$6 and \$3.6 million, respectively. On the other hand, the industrial gas manufacturing, air and gas compressor manufacturing, and construction machinery manufacturing sectors are

expected to experience an increase in the total annual value of economic output of \$5, \$4.9, and \$4.8 million, respectively.

**Table 8 – Top Five Output Industries**

<b>Impact Industry</b>	<b>Direct Impact on Output</b>	<b>Indirect Impact on Output</b>	<b>Induced Impact on Output</b>	<b>Total Impact on Output</b>
Shipbuilding and repairing	\$(6,057,493)	\$(24,371)	\$(19)	\$(6,081,883)
Industrial gas manufacturing	\$5,005,358	\$14,897	\$(58)	\$5,020,198
Air and gas compressor manufacturing	\$4,874,950	\$69	\$(0.02)	\$4,875,018
Construction machinery manufacturing	\$4,821,573	\$209	\$(0.24)	\$4,821,782
Other concrete product manufacturing	\$(3,647,465)	\$(1,100)	\$(17)	\$(3,648,582)

\*IMPLAN Model 2021 (San Diego County)

## **IX. CONCLUSION**

The proposed amendments to Rule 1210 are necessary in order to establish a health protective threshold to the greatest extent feasible that brings benefits to the region, to align the risk reduction and public notification thresholds, for consistency with the cancer risk reduction thresholds implemented by other California air districts, to further protect public health from toxic air contaminants in accordance with the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program, and to fulfill the direction of the former Air Pollution Control Board.

The average annual compliance costs due to proposed amended Rule 1210 is estimated to be \$10 to \$16 million for the low-cost and high-cost scenario, respectively. The sectors of shipbuilding and mineral processing will incur the majority share of the estimated total annualized cost.

Proposed amended Rule 1210 is expected to result in some jobs forgone annually between 2022 and 2032 when a 4% real interest rate is assumed. The projected job impacts represent about 0.003% of the total employment in San Diego County. While the university, shipbuilding, and other concrete product manufacturing sectors are expected to lose some jobs annually, construction and air and gas manufacturing are expected to gain few jobs due to additional spending in these sectors.

On the other hand, mitigating levels of air toxics can serve to reduce the inhalation or non-inhalation dose a resident or worker experiences, thus reducing excess estimated cancer risk. Although monetary benefits of reducing estimated cancer risks have not been specifically quantified, the value of morbidity incidence results from four components: 1) costs to reduce the risk of illness, 2) costs for treatments such as medical care and medication, 3) costs due to lost time from paid work or maintaining a home, and 4) costs resulting from pain and suffering.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A - List of Facilities Potentially Affected by Proposed Amended Rule 1210 (current as of 10/5/2021)

Emission Inventory Year	Facility Name	Facility ZIP Code	Estimated cancer risk Reported by Health Risk Assessment Conducted by Facility
2013	BAE Systems	92113	<b>11.8<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	BAE Systems	92113	<b>10.5</b>
2018	CA Commercial Asphalt Enterprises	92145	Pending
2019	CA Commercial Asphalt Enterprises	92040	Pending
2013	Canyon Rock	92120	<b>12.4<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	Canyon Rock	92120	Pending
2016	Chromalloy - San Diego	92121	0.08
2016	City of San Diego -Public Utilities Department	92121	5.25
2017	City of San Diego/Miramar Landfill	92111	<b>19.5<sup>b</sup></b>
2017	Encina Wastewater Authority	92011	4.16
2013	General Dynamics NASSCO	92113	<b>53<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	General Dynamics NASSCO	92113	<b>53<sup>a</sup></b>
2018	Grossmont District Hospital	91942	Pending
2017	Hanson Aggregates	92145	3.30
2019	Hanson Aggregates Pacific Southwest Region	92071	1.69
2018	Kaiser Foundation Hospitals	92120	0.69
2018	Minnesota Methane LLC San Diego Miramar Facility	92111	0.22
2013	Otay Landfill Inc	91911	<b>32.95<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	Otay Landfill Inc	91911	7.6
2019	Pacific Ship Repair & Fabrication Inc	92113	<b>63.4</b>
2019	Robertsons	92154	1.7
2019	Robertsons	92121	3.8
2015	Salk Institute	92037	7.86
2019	Salk Institute	92037	7.86
2017	San Diego County – Pub Wks San Marcos Landfill	92078	7.00 <sup>a</sup>
2017	San Diego State University	92182	9.4
2018	San Marcos Energy LLC	92078	0.11
2019	Superior Ready Mix LP	92025	2.3
2016	Sycamore Energy LLC	92071	0.02
2019	Sycamore Energy LLC	92071	0.02
2013	Sycamore Landfill Inc	92071	<b>38.3<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	Sycamore Landfill Inc	92071	<b>11.3</b>
2017	Vulcan Materials Western Division	92126	0.4

#### Notes

1. This list includes all facilities that were required to conduct a health risk assessment based on their potential estimated cancer risk and may be affected by revisions to cancer risk reductions thresholds under Rule 1210.
2. This list includes the potential estimated cancer risks that were reported by the health risk assessment conducted by the facility. Per state law, all health risk assessments must be reviewed and approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer.
3. Calculated estimated cancer risks with (a) have been reviewed and approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer.
4. Potential estimated cancer risks in **bold** are greater than 10, based on information currently available.
5. Facilities that have "pending" under the "estimated cancer risk" have a future deadline to submit the health risk assessment or are subject to enforcement actions for not submitting a health risk assessment to the Air Pollution Control Officer in accordance with State law.
6. (b) Based on revised health risk assessment.
7. This list of potentially affected facilities is subject to change as more recent health risk assessments are evaluated and approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer.



## Appendix B - Other Socioeconomic Impacts in San Diego County

### Table B.1 - Top 5 Value Added Industries

Impact Industry	Impact Total Value Added	Impact Total Value Added	Impact Total Value Added	Impact Total Value Added
Industrial gas manufacturing	\$2,448,859	\$7,288	\$(28.26)	\$2,456,119
Shipbuilding and repairing	\$(2,443,228)	\$(9,829)	\$(7.46)	\$(2,453,066)
Air and gas compressor manufacturing	\$1,460,863	\$20.58	\$(0.01)	\$1,460,884
Junior colleges, colleges, universities, and professional schools	\$(1,386,276)	\$(6,851)	\$(8,278)	\$(1,401,406)
Electric power generation - Fossil fuel	\$(1,364,092)	\$676.01	\$(64.73)	\$(1,363,481)
<b>Total</b>	\$(1,300,486)	\$(456,108)	\$(1,130,403)	\$(2,886,998)

**Table B.2 - Top 15 Industries by Estimated Growth Percentage**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Impact Industry</b>	<b>Industry Total Output</b>	<b>Impact Output</b>
1	Air and gas compressor manufacturing	\$4,305,674	\$4,875,018
2	Other concrete product manufacturing	\$10,791,081	\$(3,648,581)
3	Construction machinery manufacturing	\$25,391,506	\$4,821,781
4	Industrial gas manufacturing	\$42,618,035	\$5,020,197
5	Electric power generation - Fossil fuel	\$75,364,284	\$(2,528,630)
6	Carbon and graphite product manufacturing	\$52,184,380	\$963,507
7	Shipbuilding and repairing	\$1,952,295,480	\$(6,081,882)
8	Cement manufacturing	\$39,824,832	\$(86,278)
9	Junior colleges, colleges, universities, and professional schools	\$1,071,491,342	\$(1,933,612)
10	Other engine equipment manufacturing	\$17,706,899	\$30,047
11	Water, sewage and other systems	\$99,407,460	\$(146,831)
12	Construction of new manufacturing structures	\$782,612,056	\$1,120,334
13	Ground or treated mineral and earth manufacturing	\$17,002,387	\$14,655
14	All other petroleum and coal products manufacturing	\$38,022,433	\$31,102
15	Sand and gravel mining	\$88,032,172	\$(53,172)

**Table B.3 - Tax Results**

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Sub County General</b>	<b>Sub County Special Districts</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Federal</b>	<b>Total</b>
Direct Effect	\$(62,791)	\$(75,739)	\$(31,968)	\$(195,229)	\$(405,742)	\$(771,470)
Indirect Effect	\$18,376	\$21,983	\$9,276	\$21,961	\$(59,340)	\$12,258
Induced Effect	\$(21,697)	\$(26,139)	\$(11,032)	\$(72,911)	\$(129,602)	\$(261,384)
<b>Total</b>	\$(66,112)	\$(79,895)	\$(33,724)	\$(246,179)	\$(594,685)	\$(1,020,597)

**SAN DIEGO COUNTY  
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT**

**CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15187  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

**1. Project Title:**

San Diego Air Pollution Control District Rule 1210 – Toxic Air Contaminant Public Health Risks-Public Notification and Risk Reduction

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (District)  
10124 Old Grove Road  
San Diego, CA 92131

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Eric Luther, (858) 586-2806

**4. Project Location:**

San Diego County

**5. Description of Project:**

District Rule 1210 was first adopted in 1996 to establish public notification and risk reduction thresholds and procedures for San Diego County. Rule 1210, which has not been revised since adoption, establishes the cancer risk reduction threshold as 100 in one million, which means that facilities contributing to an increased estimated cancer risk do not need to reduce their risk unless the risk is equal to or greater than 100 in one million (i.e., the likelihood that up to 100 people, out of one million equally exposed people, would contract cancer).

The District is proposing to decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million for the following reasons:

- Establish a health protective limit. Given the scientific data established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), which demonstrates the contaminants emitted by the facilities subject to this amendment create an increased estimated cancer risk, the District has a responsibility to require cancer risk reductions to the extent it is feasible. The rule, as proposed, allows for extensions when it is not feasible to reduce the estimated cancer risk to below the significant risk threshold. The District must consider extensions because for some industries, technology is not feasible and is still advancing.
- Align the cancer risk reduction threshold with the significant risk notification threshold, which is currently 10 in one million. It is just and necessary to reduce confirmed high risks from controllable emissions to a small number of disproportionately affected people.
- Make the cancer risk reduction threshold consistent with 11 other California air districts that have already implemented a 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold. California has a total of 35 local air districts and out of these 35 air districts, the five largest districts include: San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD); San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Valley Air District); South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD); Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (Sac Metro AQMD). Out of the five largest districts, SDAPCD and Valley Air District are the only districts that have a 100 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold.

South Coast AQMD has a 25 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold and Sac Metro AQMD and BAAQMD have a 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold.

- The District has carefully evaluated the impact of this proposal on the facilities under its jurisdiction (in San Diego County). Specifically, the District has quantified the toxic air contaminants from all facilities subject to the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program through the 2019 calendar year. The District has also identified the facilities that might create elevated health risks and require health risk assessments, which quantify the health risks. In accordance with State law, health risk assessments are conducted by the facilities, reviewed by OEHHA, and approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer. Under this evaluation, the District identified up to 26 facilities that may be subject to the proposed change in the cancer risk reduction threshold. For context, the District evaluated a total of approximately 400 facilities under its jurisdiction and, out of the 400 facilities evaluated, it identified up to 26 facilities that may be affected by this proposal. Based on the nature of the facilities identified, it is feasible for most of them to reduce estimated cancer risks within a 5-year period. Some facilities might need additional time to reduce the estimated cancer risk to below 10 in one million due to future technological advancements, which is why the proposed rule has provisions for extension when reducing the estimated cancer risk is not feasible.

The types of facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility will take to comply. The potential actions they could take include installing control devices or modifying their operations. The list of potential control devices that may be installed are baghouses, carbon adsorption and oxidation catalysts, enclosures with HEPA filters or diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts. Adding these types of control devices will require a modification of their District permit to operate. A facility may also choose to modify their operation by paving haul roads, using soil stabilizers, increased watering of haul roads, limiting their hours of operation or relocating their operation. These types of operational changes would also be reflected in a facility’s permit to operate. A facility-specific CEQA review will be conducted during permit modification to determine if proposed actions to comply with Rule 1210 risk reduction requirements could result in an environmental impact.

#### **6. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts of the Methods of Compliance:**

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The intent of the regulation is to improve air quality by reducing cancer-causing air pollutants and imposing the revised rule by the District would therefore be categorically exempt under Section 15308 of the CEQA Guidelines. Nonetheless, the methods of compliance, to the extent they are known, are analyzed herein for any significant environmental impacts pursuant to Section 15187 of the CEQA Guidelines.

To comply with this rule revision only minor modifications to existing 26 industrial facilities will be required because new facilities are required to comply with different rules. The types of facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. It is not known which actions each facility affected by this rule will take to comply. Some potential types of control equipment which may be used to comply with the rule are baghouses, carbon absorption, oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, thermal oxidizers, wet gas scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators. Some alternative types of activities which may be employed to comply with the rule are paving dirt roads, watering dirt roads/piles, reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation and other minor changes to facilities or operations.

Based upon the types of facilities affected and the potential controls that may be used to comply with the rule revision, there is certainty there will be no environmental impacts or cumulative environmental impacts (as analyzed in the attachment) in the areas of aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, land use and planning, mineral resources,

population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, or wildfire. In the following document each of these areas is examined further to evaluate questions related to each topic. Evaluation of cumulative environmental impacts for the following issues are:

- Noise – To comply with this rule revision only minor modifications to existing industrial facilities will be required. Therefore, no construction impacts are expected to occur as a result of this rule revision. Since these facilities are already established in the community and have existing operations producing noise impacts, there will be no additional noise impacts from control equipment or minor operational changes.
- Energy – Impacts from energy usage at existing facilities are estimated as a result of control devices potentially being installed to comply with this rule revision. The high estimate is an increase of 12.17 GWh per year. This would represent an increase of 0.09% of energy used in San Diego County in the non-residential sector per year. Therefore, this is not considered to be a significant impact on energy resources.
- Hazards and hazardous materials – To comply with this rule revision, only minor modifications to existing industrial facilities will be required. Some of the control equipment which could be used to comply with this rule may generate small quantities of hazardous materials. These facilities have existing hazardous waste permits and must follow state and local regulations which cover the storage and transfer of hazardous materials. Therefore, no increased environmental impacts are expected from the revision of this rule.
- Hydrology and Water Quality – To comply with this rule revision, some facilities may choose to water dirt roads at existing industrial facilities. APCD analyzed potential water patterns at three active landfills in San Diego County that could be affected by the rule revision. This assumed watering twelve feet wide dirt roads, five miles in length, twice a day. The total water increase using high water use assumptions would be 0.02% of existing commercial/industrial water use in San Diego county. Therefore, the rule revision is not considered to be a significant impact on water resources.
- Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions – To comply with this rule revision, only minor modifications to existing industrial facilities will be required. Therefore, no short-term construction impacts are expected from this rule revision. Energy increase expected from this rule revision for operations is estimated to be 0.09% increase in the non-residential sector. The impact to energy is determined to be not significant. This increase in energy consumption could potentially contribute to an increase in GHGs produced. The potential GHG increase from the increase in energy consumption from the rule revision is estimated to be 4,907 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Another potential source of GHG emissions would come from off-road trucks used to water dirt roads at existing landfills. The District estimates 59.2 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year from this activity. The District does not have an established GHG threshold of significance. However, the District compared this increase to the level of significance threshold for stationary sources from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and South Coast Air Quality Management District which have a significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Therefore, this impact is not significant for greenhouse gas emissions.

#### **7. Evaluation of Reasonably Foreseeable Mitigation Measures:**

Because no significant environmental impacts have been identified, no mitigation is proposed and would be speculative. However, when affected facilities choose to install control equipment or make an operational change subject to a revised District permit, any potential environmental impacts will be evaluated at that time and mitigation can be imposed if significant environmental impacts are determined to be caused by compliance.

**8. Evaluation of Reasonably Foreseeable Alternative Means of Compliance:**

Because no significant environmental impacts have been identified, no alternative methods to avoid or eliminate impacts from compliance are proposed and would be speculative. However, compliance can be achieved in some instances without installing new controls by reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation or relocating operations.

**9. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:**

None

**10. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

No, California Native American tribes have not requested consultation for this project.

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors, as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.



Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility will take to comply. The potential actions they take include installing control devices or modifying their operations. The list of potential control devices that may be installed are baghouses, carbon adsorption and oxidation catalysts, enclosures with HEPA filters or diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts. Adding these types of control devices will require a modification of their District permit to operate. A facility may also choose to modify their operation by paving haul roads, using soil stabilizers, increased watering of haul roads or by limiting their hours of operation. The project does not propose any changes to existing building structures; therefore, there is no impact relating to scenic vistas or visual character of existing facilities. The project does not propose any changes to outdoor lighting, and therefore there is no impact relating to the creation of new sources of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment <u>project</u> ; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility will take to comply. The potential actions they take include installing control devices or modifying their operations. The list of potential control devices that may be installed are baghouses, carbon adsorption and oxidation catalysts, enclosures with HEPA filters or diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts. Adding these types of control devices will require a modification of their District permit to operate. A facility may also choose to modify their operation by paving haul roads, using soil stabilizers, increased watering of haul roads or by limiting their hours of operation. Therefore, project implementation would not convert prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance to nonagricultural use; conflict with agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract; convert forest land to non-forest use; or involve other changes that might ultimately result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on agricultural resources.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. It is not known which actions each facility affected by this rule will take to comply. Some potential types of control equipment which may be used to comply with the rule are baghouses, carbon absorption, oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, thermal oxidizers, wet gas scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators. Some alternative types of activities which may be employed to comply with the rule are paving dirt roads, watering dirt roads/piles, reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation and other minor changes to facilities or operations.

Table 1 below shows estimated emissions from paving approximately five miles of dirt roads at three local landfills which may be affected by this rule revision. San Diego County screening levels of significance were used for comparison. Based on the comparison, paving dirt roads at three local landfills will not cause significant emissions.

Table 2 below shows estimated emissions from off-road trucks while watering dirt roads at three local landfills which may be affected by this rule revision. San Diego County screening levels of significance were used for comparison. Based on the comparison, watering dirt roads at three local landfills will not cause significant emissions.

The potential actions that facilities may take to comply with the rule will reduce the emissions of air pollutants and associated estimated cancer risks, and as such will not conflict or obstruct with the implementation of an air quality plan; result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or result in other emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Since this rule will establish a more health protective limit for the cancer risk reduction threshold, the project will improve air quality in the issues analyzed.

Table 1 – Estimated Emissions from Construction Activities  
Related to Paving Dirt Roads at Three Landfills

Pollutant	NOx	CO	VOC	PM10	SOx
Total Estimated Paving Emissions (Lbs.)	75	65	13	4	0
Screening Level Threshold of Significance (Lbs. Per Day)	250	550	75	100	250
Above Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No

Table 2 – Estimated Emissions from Off-Road Trucks  
While Watering Dirt Roads at Three Landfills

Pollutant	NOx	CO	VOC	PM10	SOx
Estimated Operational Emissions (Tons Per Year)	0.16	0.13	0.03	0.01	0.001
Screening Level Threshold of Significance (Tons Per Year)	40	100	13.7	15	40
Above Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No

Issues

Potentially Significant Impact      Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      Less Than Significant Impact      No Impact

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) <u>Have</u> a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) <u>Have</u> a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) <u>Have</u> a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility will take to comply. The potential actions they take include installing control devices or modifying their operations. The list of potential control devices that may be installed are baghouses, carbon adsorption and oxidation catalysts, enclosures with HEPA filters or diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts. Adding these types of control devices will require a modification of their District permit to operate. A facility may also choose to modify their operation by paving haul roads, using soil stabilizers, increased watering of haul roads or by limiting their hours of operation. Compliance with the revised rule would not require any new disturbance of habitat or vegetation. Project implementation would have no effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; would have no effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; and would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on biological resources.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility will take to comply. The potential actions they take include installing control devices or modifying their operations. The list of potential control devices that may be installed are baghouses, carbon adsorption and oxidation catalysts, enclosures with HEPA filters or diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts. Adding these types of control devices will require a modification of their District permit to operate. A facility may also choose to modify their operation by paving haul roads, using soil stabilizers, increased watering of haul roads or by limiting their hours of operation. Compliance with the revised rule would occur within existing, non-historic facilities and not require new ground disturbance. Project implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource; would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; and would not unlawfully disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on cultural resources.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. ENERGY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility will take to comply. The potential actions they take include installing control devices or modifying their operations. The list of potential control devices that may be installed are baghouses, carbon adsorption and oxidation catalysts, enclosures with HEPA filters or diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts. Adding these types of control devices will require a modification of their District permit to operate. A facility may also choose to modify their operation by paving haul roads, using soil stabilizers, increased watering of haul roads or by limiting their hours of operation. Facilities that choose to install various control devices may result in minimal additional energy use, but proposed rule amendment does not mandate the use of controls, and any changes would be further evaluated during the process of modifying their permit. Project implementation would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy or conflict with any state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on energy.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative <u>waste water</u> disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility will take to comply. The potential actions they take include installing control devices or modifying their operations. The list of potential control devices that may be installed are baghouses, carbon adsorption and oxidation catalysts, enclosures with HEPA filters or diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts. Adding these types of control devices will require a modification of their District permit to operate. A facility may also choose to modify their operation by paving haul roads, using soil stabilizers, increased watering of haul roads or by limiting their hours of operation. Project implementation would not expose people to the risk of loss, injury, or death associated with earthquakes, seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides. It would not result in soil erosion, loss of topsoil, be located on soil that is unstable, or located on expansive soil. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on geology/soils.



Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility affected by this rule will take to comply. Some potential types of control equipment which may be used to comply with the rule are baghouses, carbon absorption, oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, thermal oxidizers, wet gas scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators. Some alternative types of activities which may be taken to comply with the rule are paving dirt roads, watering dirt roads/piles, reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation and other minor changes to existing facilities or operations. There could be minimal construction related and operational GHG generated to comply with this rule, but it is speculative to predict which control options will be selected. However, the District estimates 59.2 metric tons of CO2e per year from off-road trucks used to water dirt roads at existing landfills. Depending on the facility process and control device used, small amounts of GHG may be created. Specific impacts associated with compliance with this rule would be analyzed as part of a permit application for an individual facility. Complying with this rule will also not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHG. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on GHG emissions.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. Depending on the facility process and control device used, small amounts of hazardous waste may be created such as contaminants from baghouses and diesel particulate filters. However, the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, create a significant hazard to the public due to an accident or upset condition, or create hazardous emissions, materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a school. The project will not affect a facility located on a site included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 56962.5 and as a result would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The project will not affect the safety of people residing or working within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport; therefore, no impact is expected. The project will not impair or interfere with adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. The project will not increase exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death due to wildland fires. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on hazards or hazardous materials.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or <u>off-site</u> ;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or <u>offsite</u> ;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility affected by this rule will take to comply. Some potential types of control equipment which may be used to comply with the rule are baghouses, carbon absorption, oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, thermal oxidizers, wet gas scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators. Some alternative types of activities which may be taken to comply with the rule are paving dirt roads, watering dirt roads/piles, reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation and other minor changes to existing facilities or operations. To comply with the rule there may be a potential for increased watering at landfills and mineral processing facilities; however, the amount of water used to achieve this is not anticipated to cause a significant impact from water runoff. Project implementation would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area; would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity for existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality; would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area; would not place structures which would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area; and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, death, inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, no impact to hydrology or water quality is expected.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established <u>community</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The proposed rule amendments would apply to existing 26 industrial facilities in San Diego County. Project implementation would not physically divide an established community; would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; and would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on land use/planning.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific <u>plan</u> or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility will take to comply. The potential actions they take include installing control devices or modifying their operations. The list of potential control devices that may be installed are baghouses, carbon adsorption and oxidation catalysts, enclosures with HEPA filters or diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts. Adding these types of control devices will require a modification of their District permit to operate. A facility may also choose to modify their operation by paving haul roads, using soil stabilizers, increased watering of haul roads or by limiting their hours of operation. None of the existing 26 facilities are located on a known mineral resource. Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State; and would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on mineral resources.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIII. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility affected by this rule will take to comply. Some potential types of control equipment which may be used to comply with the rule are baghouses, carbon absorption, oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, thermal oxidizers, wet gas scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators. Some alternative types of activities which may be taken to comply with the rule are paving dirt roads, watering dirt roads/piles, reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation and other minor changes to existing facilities or operations. The proposed rule amendments would apply to 26 existing industrial facilities in San Diego County, and potential control options would not be expected to result in additional noise from the facilities over current ambient noise levels. Project implementation would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of applicable standards; would not expose people to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or noise; would not result in a substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels; and would not affect any airport land use plan or private air strip. Based on this discussion it is expected that project implementation would have a less than significant noise impact.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The proposed rule amendments apply to 26 existing industrial facilities in San Diego County. Project implementation would not induce substantial growth and would not displace substantial numbers of housing or people, requiring the construction of replacement housing. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on population/housing.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The proposed rule amendments apply to 26 existing industrial facilities in San Diego County. There will be no physical impacts to governmental facilities, and no new or altered governmental facilities would be required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public services. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on public services.



Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. RECREATION.</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The proposed rule amendments apply to 26 existing industrial facilities in San Diego County. Project implementation would not result in increased use of any existing neighborhood park, regional park or recreation facility. The project does not include recreational facilities, nor does it require construction or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, it is expected that the project would have no adverse impact on recreational facilities.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION.</b> Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility affected by this rule will take to comply. Some potential types of control equipment which may be used to comply with the rule are baghouses, carbon absorption, oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, thermal oxidizers, wet gas scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators. Some alternative types of activities which may be taken to comply with the rule are paving dirt roads, watering dirt roads/piles, reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation and other minor changes to existing facilities or operations. Project implementation would not cause a substantial increase in traffic or vehicle miles traveled in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system; would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the regional congestion management agency for any road or highway; would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses; would not result in inadequate emergency access or parking capacity; and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no impact on transportation or vehicle miles traveled.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b>				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility affected by this rule will take to comply. Some potential types of control equipment which may be used to comply with the rule are baghouses, carbon absorption, oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, thermal oxidizers, wet gas scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators. Some alternative types of activities which may be taken to comply with the rule are paving dirt roads, watering dirt roads/piles, reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation and other minor changes to existing facilities or operations. The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no impact on tribal cultural resources.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, <u>dry</u> and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the <u>waste water</u> treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste <u>in excess of</u> state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility affected by this rule will take to comply. Some potential types of control equipment which may be used to comply with the rule are baghouses, carbon absorption, oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, thermal oxidizers, wet gas scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators. Some alternative types of activities which may be taken to comply with the rule are paving dirt roads, watering dirt roads/piles, reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation and other minor changes to existing facilities or operations. To comply with the rule there may be a potential for increased watering at landfills and mineral processing facilities; however, the amount of water used is not anticipated to cause a significant impact for stormwater drainage. Implementation of the project will not cause changes to the existing wastewater facilities. Project implementation would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the regional water quality control board; would not require or result in the construction of new water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities; would not require water supplies in excess of existing entitlements and resources or require new or expanded entitlements; would not require additional wastewater treatment capacity or landfill capacity; and would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on utilities/service systems.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XX. WILDFIRE.</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, <u>as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The proposed rule amendments apply to 26 existing industrial facilities in San Diego County. Project implementation will not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; exacerbate wildfire risks; require the installation of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk; or expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on wildfire.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant <u>With</u> Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the <u>number</u> or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of revising an air pollution control rule which will decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million to establish a more health protective limit. The proposed rule amendments apply to 26 existing industrial facilities in San Diego County. The types of existing facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, turbine repair and testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. Some potential types of control equipment which may be used to comply with the rule are baghouses, carbon absorption, oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, thermal oxidizers, wet gas scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators. Also, some alternative types of activities may be employed to comply with the rule are paving dirt roads, watering dirt roads/piles, reducing operational throughput and or hours of operation and other minor changes to facilities or operations. When affected facilities choose to install control equipment or make an operational change subject to a revised District permit, any potential environmental impacts will be evaluated at that time. Based on the analysis in this document, the Air Pollution Control District finds that this project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project does not have cumulatively considerable impacts nor have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

**SAN DIEGO COUNTY  
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT**

**DRAFT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO  
RULE 1210 – TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS-  
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION**

**WORKSHOP REPORT**

The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (District) held a public workshop on August 5, 2021, to discuss and receive input on the draft proposed amendments to Rule 1210 – Toxic Air Contaminant Public Health Risks-Public Notification and Risk Reduction. A meeting notice was mailed to each permit holder, applicant, registration holder, chamber of commerce in the region, as well as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California Air Resources Board (CARB). Additionally, a meeting notice was posted on the District’s website and distributed to interested parties, including through the District’s electronic mail service.

The workshop was attended by 32 people and the District received 12 written comments. A summary of the comments and District responses are provided below:

**1. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The District stated during the workshop that 30 facilities may be impacted by the proposed amendments. Will these facilities be notified by the District?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Yes, if the proposed amendments to Rule 1210 are adopted, the District will notify each facility that it is subject to public notification and risk reduction requirements provided the estimated cancer risk reported in the health risk assessment, as approved by the District, is equal to or greater than 10 in one million. A current list of potentially impacted facilities is included as an Attachment to this Workshop Report.

**2. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Will hospitals be affected by the proposed amendments?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

If Rule 1210 is adopted as proposed, any stationary source, including hospitals, would be subject to the rule’s public notification and risk reduction requirements provided the estimated cancer risk reported in the health risk assessment, as approved by the District, is equal to or greater than 10 in one million. At this time, two hospitals are on the list of potentially impacted facilities.

**3. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Will dry cleaners be affected by the proposed amendments?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Section (b) Exemptions provides an exemption from Section (d) Public Notification and Public Meeting Requirements and Section (e) Risk Reduction Audits and Plans to stationary sources for which industry-wide health risk assessments are prepared by the Air Pollution Control Officer pursuant to Section 44323 of the California Health and Safety Code. This exemption applies to dry cleaners.

**4. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The District's website lists about 70 facilities that are subject to the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program. There are some facilities that have submitted emissions inventories and have yet to be prioritized and categorized by the District. How did the District determine that 30 facilities will be impacted by the proposed amendments if some of the health risk assessments are currently pending District approval?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District has completed emissions inventories and prioritization scores for all facilities subject to the Air Toxic "Hot Spots" Program up to the 2019 calendar year. For facilities that have exceeded the prioritization score thresholds, the District has requested health risk assessments to quantify the health risks.

There are currently 26 facilities that were required to conduct a health risk assessment as a result of cancer risk prioritization scores. A current list of potentially impacted facilities is included as an Attachment to this Workshop Report.

**5. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Will specific industries be considered first under the proposed amendments?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

No. The public notification and risk reduction requirements apply to a stationary source only if the risks estimated in the approved health risk assessment are equal to or greater than the significant risk threshold(s) specified in the rule.



**6. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Will the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program prioritization and refinement process be similar after amended Rule 1210 is adopted?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Yes. The prioritization and refinement procedures that the District currently follows are not being revised with this proposal.

**7. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Health risk assessments that were requested, submitted, or approved by the District prior to adoption of the proposed amended rule should remain subject to the requirements of existing Rule 1210, while the proposed rule amendments should only apply to new Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program related emissions inventories.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Proposed Subsection (e)(1) has been amended to clarify that risk reduction audits and plans apply to the significant risk threshold for maximum individual cancer risks 1) equal to or greater than 10 in one million for emissions inventory years 2018 and later, or 2) equal to or greater than 100 in one million for emissions inventory years prior to 2018.

**8. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Section (b) Exemptions states that industry-wide health risk assessment sources are not subject to the public notification requirements. This section should be revised to require public notification if a source exceeds the significant risk threshold.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Section (b) Exemptions is consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 44323. The District still quantifies emissions from these facilities and calculates the prioritization scores. There are about 3,600 facilities under this category, including gas stations, emergency engines, boilers and other small operations. The District will evaluate alternatives to address facilities with elevated prioritization scores and make the information related to these facilities readily available to the public. The District will evaluate the feasibility of posting this information on the District’s website on an interactive map.

**9. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (e)(3) (new proposed Subsection (e)(5)) specifies that the District may authorize a 3-year extension to implement the risk reduction audit and plan for facilities that qualify for the extension. Due to the nature of the military mission, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) must go through an extensive period of time to identify, develop, test, and approve new technologies. New technologies must not only meet risk reduction requirements but are required to meet strict military specification approvals and be procured through the DoD equipment acquisition process. Due to this potential impact to mission, the DoD requests a military specific exemption from proposed Subsection (e)(3) (new proposed Subsection (e)(5)) allowing military operations to continue under an ongoing emissions reduction plan approved by the District, without a specific time limit. This will ensure military operations are not impacted while going through the process to adopt new technology or to implement end of stack controls to limit air emissions.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District is unable to grant an unlimited extension for a particular regulated entity as it has a responsibility to ensure a level playing field for all regulated entities, especially as it relates to requirements designed to protect public health (such as reducing cancer risk). Additionally, facilities subject to risk reduction requirements have 5 years to reduce their health risks from when the District approves the risk reduction audit and plan. In the event facilities are unable to reduce the health risks within 5 years, extensions may be granted under certain circumstances. The proposed amended rule requires health risk reductions only to the extent it is feasible. Therefore, the proposed amended rule will not preclude facilities from operating provided all feasible control measures are implemented. Also, at this time the District does not anticipate that any military facilities will be impacted by the proposed rule amendments.

**10. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (c)(2)(ii) should be revised to remove the phrase “*while taking into consideration the cost of achieving health risk reductions*” because the cost of a proven and feasible T-BARCT device or technique may preclude its implementation. Cost considerations are provided for in proposed Subsection (c)(4) definition for “Economically Practicable.”

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The proposed definition for “Economically Practicable” and references to the term in the rule have been removed from the proposed amended rule.

Per the proposed amended rule, the T-BARCT definition would only apply if a facility is unable to reduce the risk to below the significant risk threshold(s) within 5 years. Since T-BARCT is the Best Available **Retrofit** Control Technology for Toxics, it includes cost considerations. However, the District will not conduct a cost-effectiveness analysis (as conducted when implementing Best Available Control Technology (BACT) requirements) when determining if a facility can

implement T-BARCT. Since the proposed amended rule is designed to protect public health by decreasing health risks, such as cancer risk, in order to conduct a cost-effectiveness analysis, the District would need to assign a dollar value to health risk outcomes, which would not be reasonable.

When determining if T-BARCT has been implemented, District staff will review available information on current achievable emission limits and potential controls for each source category contributing to the risk exceedances. This information includes guidelines and recent determinations of BACT, T-BARCT, Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT), and Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER), Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) from EPA, CARB, and other air districts. District staff will also review the following:

- Current levels of BACT/T-BARCT/RACT/LAER/MACT controls and emissions (and next more stringent levels of BACT/T-BARCT/RACT/LAER/MACT controls, if available);
- Potential emission reductions that would result in risk reductions (and incremental additional potential emission reductions, if available); and
- Estimated capital and annual costs for retrofit of controls to existing facilities to evaluate controls and emission limits with a cost within reasonable bounds. Specifically, District staff would evaluate if the costs are within the financial capability of the facility and would not result in adverse economic consequences, such as a significant loss of jobs or elimination of a product or service.
- Potential non-air quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements to identify and minimize any environmental effects and promote sustainability.

Furthermore, the proposed amended rule only requires implementation of T-BARCT if a facility cannot reduce the risk to below the significant risk threshold(s) within 5 years. The District is proposing to implement a transparent process for determining whether an extension will be granted by conducting public meetings prior to granting an extension to any facility. During the meeting the District will explain its preliminary decision regarding the extension and solicit input. Therefore, the public will have an opportunity to provide input for all extensions to be considered by the District.

## **11. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed amended Rule 1210 has two different cost standards. Proposed Subsection (c)(2) “Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT)” defines T-BARCT as “...taking into consideration the cost of achieving health risk reductions, any non-air quality health and environmental impacts, and energy requirements,” and proposed Subsection (c)(4) defines “Economically Practicable.” The reference to cost in the T-BARCT definition is sufficient as long as the District consistently and fairly evaluates the cost-effectiveness and reasonableness of the cost expenditure versus the reductions achieved. Therefore, proposed Subsection (c)(4) “Economically Practicable” and references to this term should be removed from the rule. Further,

the District should develop guidance, in collaboration with stakeholders, regarding cost considerations when requiring T-BARCT.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 10.

**12. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Existing Subsection (c)(10) definition of “Prioritization Score” and references to the term are proposed for removal from the rule. Prioritization scoring is an important tool for determining if a health risk assessment is required. This is a critical step in light of the additional facilities that will be subject to the proposed rule amendments. Why is the definition proposed for removal?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Prioritization is one of the key elements of the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program that the District implements per State law. Existing Subsection (c)(10) “Prioritization Score” had been proposed for removal prior to the workshop because the term was referenced only in existing Subsection (d)(4)(i). That subsection was also proposed for removal because it is outdated and no longer needed. However, because proposed amended Subsection (d)(8) now references prioritization scores, the definition for “Prioritization Score” will remain in the rule.

**13. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The definition of “Sensitive Receptors” should be revised to include healthcare facilities, e.g., community clinics.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The proposed definition of “Sensitive Receptors” has been revised to include healthcare facilities.

**14. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

When the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) updates its toxic air contaminant information, the Rule 1210 tables (Table I, II, and III) are affected, and a 30-day notice is published by the District. If OEHHA proposes a revision while the District is creating its prioritization score, the OEHHA toxic air contaminant list should be utilized. Likewise, if there are revisions to any of the toxic air contaminants midstream a permit process, the risk analysis should be updated accordingly. Therefore, proposed Subsection (c)(21) (new proposed Subsection (c)(23)) “Toxic Air Contaminant” should be revised to incorporate by reference the OEHHA updated toxic air contaminant list.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District disagrees. Both Rule 1200 – Toxic Air Contaminants-New Source Review and Rule 1210 have the same definition for “Toxic Air Contaminants” and the same Table I (carcinogenic), Table II (noncarcinogenic-chronic) and Table III (noncarcinogenic-acute). Amending the definition in one rule will make the definition and the tables in the other rule inconsistent, causing confusion. The District commits to revising the tables expeditiously, through the current 30-day public notification process, as soon as OEHHA makes changes to the Consolidated Table of OEHHA/ARB Approved Risk Assessment Health Values.

**15. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The term “technically feasible” is referenced throughout the proposed amended rule for requiring T-BARCT and other potential modification to facility operations that are required to reduce emissions. However, the term is not defined in Section (c) Definitions and should be included.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. A definition for “Technically Feasible” has been added to the proposed amended rule.

**16. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

What is the rationale for defining proposed Subsection (c)(4) “Economically Practicable” in terms of 10% of the annual profits of a facility or 1% of the annual operational budget of a non-profit facility?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 10.

**17. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (c)(4) “Economically Practicable” should be revised so the definition applies to the parent company, not to the individual facility or branch of a company.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 10.

**18. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (c)(4) “Economically Practicable” should be revised to specify that annualized cost is calculated for a specific period of time, e.g., 5 years, or the number of years the device is projected to be in use.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 10.

**19. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The T-BARCT requirement should be included in the risk reduction audit and plan, and the economically practicable analysis should be applied for the plan and not for the device independent of the plan as specified in proposed Subsection (c)(2) “Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT).”

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 10.

**20. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The social costs of the toxic air contaminant emissions should be included in the economically practicable analysis. This analysis should include the costs associated with healthcare, premature morbidity, premature death, and loss of productivity or impaired ability to work due to illnesses.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Proposed Subsection (c)(4) definition for “Economically Practicable” and references to the term have been removed from the proposed amended rule.

While the proposed definition of T-BARCT includes cost considerations, it is only intended to consider costs that would significantly impact facilities subject to risk reduction requirements to the extent the requirements can preclude facilities from operating. Cost-effectiveness is not meaningful for risk-based regulations, such as proposed amended Rule 1210, since many other factors besides the amount of pollution affect the risk such as the toxic potency and the location of receptors.

In terms of health benefits, based on vast scientific data established by OEHHA, whose mission is to protect human health and the environment through scientific evaluation of risks posed by hazardous substances, the proposed amended rule can bring health benefits by reducing cancer risks from toxic emissions from facilities subject to the rule.

**21. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

A determination that a risk reduction measure is not economically practicable should be reevaluated biennially by the District to determine its continued accuracy.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 10. Also, new proposed Subsection (e)(5) has been added to require evaluation and implementation of all risk reduction measures which are technically feasible prior to approval of any subsequent 3-year extension (after the initial extension).

**22. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Government operated institutions like landfills cannot be categorized under corporate or non-profit as provided in the rule. Therefore, proposed Subsection (c)(4) “Economically Practicable” should be revised to include a standard for government operated institutions as *“not more than 5% of the annual operating budget.”*

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 10.

**23. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (c)(4) “Economically Practicable” and its application in implementing the proposed amended rule requirements are not adequate for the following reasons: 1. economic practicality must be considered on a case-by-case basis; 2. the purpose of air quality regulations and of the District is to protect the public, not to protect the profits of businesses; 3. businesses have an obligation to operate in a responsible manner, within the law; 4. air quality regulations have been in existence for many years and are an expected cost of doing business; and 5. it is not appropriate to ignore the health of the community by dismissing the company’s obligation to uphold air quality regulations for any reason.

Accordingly, proposed Subsection (c)(4) should be revised to: *“...the annualized cost of the airborne toxic risk reduction measures necessary to reduce the Rule 1210 Regulation XII health risk to below the significant risk threshold(s) will not put the facility out of business, as determined by a government approved independent assessor.”*

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 10.

**24. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Does the District have a guideline or procedure for evaluating what is economically practicable?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Proposed Subsection (c)(4) definition for “Economically Practicable” and references to the term have been removed from the proposed amended rule.

Facilities that are not able to reduce health risks to below 10 in one million within a 5-year period may need to implement T-BARCT and/or all technically feasible measures on all emission units contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s). The District will ensure a facility has implemented T-BARCT and/or technically feasible measures similarly to how it has been implementing T-BACT (Best Available Control Technology for Toxics) and LAER (Lowest Achievable Emission Rate) under Rule 1200 and New Source Review regulations. When applying these requirements, the District conducts extensive research to identify what control technologies, strategies or measures have been achieved in practice for the operation being evaluated.

**25. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Can the District provide an example of an analysis demonstrating that a risk reduction measure was determined to be economically practicable?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 24.

**26. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The proposed amendments state that the time period for compliance may be shortened or extended based on what is “economically practicable” for a facility. “Economically practicable” means “whether, and to what extent, the annualized cost of the airborne toxic risk reduction measures necessary to reduce the health risk to below the significant risk threshold(s) is not more than 10% of the annual profits of a facility or 1% of the annual operational budget of a non-profit facility.” But the District has not assessed how such a definition might have an unduly burdensome impact on facilities in comparison to other definitions. Indeed, when asked about the rationale behind this proposed definition at the August 5, 2021 Workshop, the District merely responded that “the term is defined in our rule.” The District should consider and evaluate basing this definition on cost-effectiveness (i.e., level of emission reduction per dollar spent).

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 10.



## **27. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The proposed definition of “Significant Risk Threshold” in Section (c) Definitions should include an incremental reduction over time to the proposed maximum individual cancer risk of equal to or greater than 10 in one million. Specifically, the cancer risk reduction threshold should be reduced by half to below 50 in one million upon adoption of the proposed amended rule, reduced to below 25 in one million in 3 years, and then to below 10 in one million in 5 years.

This incremental approach would allow the District time to evaluate the health impacts, environmental benefits, costs, and business impacts from this reduction. One of California’s largest air districts, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), recently reduced the cancer risk reduction threshold, carefully analyzed, and documented the benefits of an incremental reduction approach, and chose to use that process to reach their risk threshold of 10 in one million.

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

At this time, only a few facilities would be subject to a cancer risk reduction threshold of 50 in one million or 25 in one million. Therefore, instead of establishing an incremental limit that would potentially result in delays in cancer risk reductions, the District is proposing a health protective threshold of 10 in one million. However, the proposed amended rule includes limited flexibility for facilities that need more time to achieve this limit due to current technological limitations.

In order to understand the District’s proposal to revise the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million, it is important to first highlight that the proposal is based upon scientific data established by OEHHA. As the lead state agency for the assessment of health risks posed by environmental contaminants, OEHHA’s mission is to protect human health and the environment through scientific evaluation of risks posed by hazardous substances. OEHHA is one of five state departments within the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA).

OEHHA implements the Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, commonly known as Proposition 65<sup>1</sup>, and compiles the state’s list of substances that cause cancer or reproductive harm. OEHHA also develops health-protective exposure levels for contaminants in air as guidance for regulatory agencies and the public. These include both cancer potency factors<sup>2</sup> and non-cancer reference exposure levels<sup>3</sup> for the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program.

The Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program establishes requirements for calculating emissions of toxic air contaminants from stationary sources and for evaluating the potential public health impacts of those emissions. It also requires the operator of “significant risk” facilities to reduce their risks below the level of significance, which is set by each air district in California and is reflected in their individually adopted cancer risk reduction thresholds.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://oehha.ca.gov/proposition-65/about-proposition-65>

<sup>2</sup> <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/CPFs042909.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://oehha.ca.gov/air/air-toxics-hot-spots>

District Rule 1210 was first adopted in 1996 to establish public notification and cancer risk reduction thresholds and procedures for San Diego County. Rule 1210, which has not been revised since adoption, establishes the cancer risk reduction threshold as 100 in one million, which means that facilities contributing to an increased cancer risk do not need to reduce their risk until the risk is equal to or greater than 100 in one million (i.e., the likelihood that up to 100 people, out of one million equally exposed people, would contract cancer).

The District is proposing to decrease the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million for the following reasons:

1. Establish a health protective limit. Given the scientific data established by OEHHA, which demonstrates the contaminants emitted by the facilities subject to this amendment create an increased cancer risk, the District has a responsibility to require cancer risk reductions to the extent it is feasible. The rule, as proposed, allows for extensions when it is not feasible to reduce the cancer risk to below the significant risk threshold(s). The District must consider extensions because for some industries, control technology is still advancing.
2. Align the cancer risk notification threshold, which is currently 10 in one million, with the cancer risk reduction threshold. It's unacceptable to provide notification to the public about elevated health risks and at the same time inform them that the facility is not required to reduce the health risk when feasible.
3. Make the cancer risk reduction threshold consistent with 11 other California air districts that have already implemented a 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold. California has a total of 35 local air districts and out of these 35, the top five largest districts include: San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD), San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Valley Air District), South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD), BAAQMD, and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (Sac Air Quality). Out of the top 5 largest districts, SDAPCD and the Valley Air District are the only districts that have a 100 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold. South Coast AQMD has a 25 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold and Sac Air Quality and BAAQMD have a 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold.
4. The District has carefully evaluated the impact of this proposal on the facilities under its jurisdiction (in San Diego County). Specifically, the District has quantified the toxic air contaminant emissions from all facilities subject to the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program through the 2019 calendar year. The District has also identified the facilities that might create elevated health risks and require health risk assessments, which quantify the health risks. In accordance with State law, health risk assessments are conducted by the facilities, reviewed by OEHHA, and approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer. Under this evaluation, the District identified up to 26 facilities that might be subject to the proposed lowering of the cancer risk reduction threshold. For context, the District evaluated approximately 400 facilities and, out of the 400 facilities evaluated, it identified up to 26 facilities that might be affected by this proposal. Based on the nature of the facilities identified, it is feasible for most of them to reduce cancer risks within a 5-year period. Some facilities might need additional time to reduce the cancer risk to below 10 in one

million due to lack of current technological advancements, which is why the proposed amended rule has provisions for extensions when reducing the cancer risk is not feasible.

5. The proposed 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold is preferable to other potential thresholds for the following reasons:
  - a. The existing 100 in one million threshold is ineffective since it does not apply to any facilities regulated by the District. No facilities in San Diego County currently exceed the 100 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold. Since Rule 1210 was adopted in 1996, only 2 facilities were subject to risk reduction requirements based on elevated cancer risk (i.e., cancer risk equal to or above 100 in one million).
  - b. A threshold of 50 in one million would not bring significant benefits since it would only apply to 2 facilities. Also, the District would miss an opportunity to reduce cancer risk and protect public health since it is feasible for facilities with a health risk below 50 in one million to reduce their cancer risk.
  - c. A threshold of 25 in one million would not be as effective as what is being proposed because it would also not apply to many facilities, and some facilities with an estimated cancer risk above 10 in one million and below 25 in one million are able to reduce their cancer risks.

## **28. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The current significant risk threshold for maximum individual cancer risk (MICR) from stationary sources under Rule 1210 is equal to or greater than 100 in one million. The proposed amendments would redefine “significant risk threshold” to include “maximum individual cancer risks equal to or greater than 10 in one million,” decreasing the current threshold by 10 times. This is an incredibly drastic change for which the District has provided little, if any, meaningful justification.

The primary justification for the proposed change offered by the District at the August 5, 2021, workshop appeared to be that other air districts in California have adopted a 10 in one million threshold. While this is true, it is also true that other air districts have adopted higher thresholds. Perhaps most notably, the South Coast AQMD has adopted a 25 in one million threshold for requiring risk reduction measures and has just completed a comprehensive study that demonstrates the effectiveness of its program. At the August 6, 2021, meeting of the South Coast AQMD Governing Board, South Coast AQMD staff presented the results of its Multiple Air Toxics Exposure V (MATES V) Study. The MATES program characterizes the concentrations of airborne toxic compounds in the South Coast Air Basin and the cancer risks associated with air toxics and is part of the South Coast AQMD’s Environmental Justice (EJ) Initiative. The MATES V Study results reflect a decrease in air toxics cancer risk of approximately 50 percent since the MATES IV Study was completed in 2012-2013. Clearly, the South Coast AQMD program is effectively reducing cancer risk from toxic air contaminant emissions.

The District has not provided any justification for imposing a more stringent standard than that adopted by the South Coast AQMD, which has far more sources of toxic air contaminants than the District. The District has stated that alternatives were considered but has provided no analysis to support that assertion or the reasons why it chose to drop those alternatives from its evaluation.

Further, the District does not appear to have considered the conservatism built into the already-existing health risk assessment process, and the effect of changes to that process over time. For example, the addition of new compounds to the list of regulated toxic air contaminants and changes to risk factors assigned to compounds already on the list frequently means that the risk estimated by a health risk assessment the same or goes up even when a facility has implemented measures to reduce emissions. General Dynamics NASSCO (NASSCO) has experienced this at its facility in San Diego. Between 2009 and 2013, NASSCO reduced its diesel particulate emissions by 16 percent, its chromium (VI) emissions by 12 percent, and its nickel emissions by 56 percent. Despite this, the calculated risk for the NASSCO facility jumped from 21 in one million to 53 in one million.

Other air districts have recognized this phenomenon and have taken steps to ensure that their toxic air contaminant rules do not become more restrictive over time as a result. For example, in evaluating its program, the Valley Air District has stated: “As we move forward, it is important to recognize that although the risk calculation methodology is changing, and will result in higher calculated risk, the apparent increase in risk is not caused by increases in actual emissions or exposures to toxic air contaminants.” (See Ex. A, p. 3.) In response to this concern, the Valley Air District undertook an analysis to thoroughly evaluate the impacts of revisions to risk assessment methodologies. The District has not undertaken any similar effort.

The inherent conservatism in the risk assessment process, and the tendency for conservatism to increase over time, dictate that restraint be exercised in setting regulatory thresholds at increasingly more stringent levels. The District has not analyzed or considered the benefits of an incremental reduction. NASSCO supports the Industrial Environmental Association’s recommendation that the MICR significant risk threshold be reduced by half, to 50 in one million, at this time.

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See Response to Workshop Comment No. 27.

In 2015, OEHHA refined its methodology by incorporating the latest science in toxics exposure. Therefore, health risk calculated with the previous methodology was underestimated due to the lack in scientific knowledge and understanding regarding the effects of toxic air contaminants on the human body.

As it relates to the recommendation to establish a cancer risk reduction threshold of 50 in one million, the proposed threshold would not be effective for San Diego County given that only 2 facilities would be subject to cancer risk reductions. One of these facilities would be NASSCO that would be required to reduce the estimated cancer risk from 53 in one million (based on the emissions that occurred in the 2013 calendar year) to below 50 in one million, which would not bring significant benefits to the community impacted by the elevated cancer risk.

**29. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

On May 22, 2019, the San Diego County Air Pollution Control Board (Board) directed the District to evaluate and analyze lowering the cancer risk significance threshold in Rule 1210.

The District has failed to conduct the analysis on toxic air pollutants as directed by the Board. To date, the regulatory process has not included meaningful opportunities for the industry to provide input on analyzing the toxic air pollution significance threshold. Although the District requested an extension in July 2020 so that it could complete further analyses as recommended by the Advisory Committee, no analysis has been provided. Instead, the District has unilaterally proposed a drastic reduction without any substantive analysis or reasoning. This is not the process that the Board envisioned or directed the District to do. The District must complete a detailed toxic emissions/risk analysis.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Please see District Response to Workshop Comment No. 27. The District is meeting Board directions and all applicable mandates as it relates to this rulemaking process. Also, the District has held three public workshops on the different options for rule amendments, in addition to several smaller meetings with stakeholders.

**30. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Has the District done an analysis of expected emission or risk reductions over time from lowering the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Yes, the District has identified the facilities that will be potentially subject to this change, see Attachment. The District has also analyzed the potential control technologies that may be used by these facilities, as analyzed in the Socioeconomic Impact Assessment.

There are multiple methods to reduce health risks and the facilities subject to risk reduction requirements are required to propose how the risk reductions will be achieved. Specifically, these facilities are required to submit an application to the District proposing how the risk reductions will be achieved. It is possible that for some facilities, risk reductions will be achieved without corresponding emission reductions.

**31. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Why did the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Valley Air District) and South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) decide to maintain their cancer risk reduction thresholds at 100 in one million and 25 in one million, respectively?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

For South Coast AQMD, the cancer risk reduction threshold of 25 in one million, established in the early 1990s, was based on what information was available at the time.

In 2015, the Valley Air District’s Governing Board directed the district to maintain the cancer risk reduction threshold at 100 in one million considering that their population density is lower compared to other regions, and most of the higher emitting industries aren’t located near the higher population density areas.

**32. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The proposed lowering of the significant risk threshold for maximum individual cancer risks to equal to or greater than 10 in one million is an appropriate first step. However, the District should reduce the cancer risk reduction threshold to one in one million to further protect public health.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

District Rule 1200 – Toxic Air Contaminants-New Source Review specifies a cancer risk reduction threshold of one in one million. This threshold applies to projects that are evaluated by the District prior to granting a Permit to Operate. The threshold being proposed under Rule 1210 applies to the entire stationary source.

**33. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Section (d) Public Notification and Public Meeting Requirements should include the requirement to notify elected officials, community planning groups, and other government recognized organizations.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District will update its public notification policy which contains specific requirements for notifying the public and stakeholders.

**34. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (d)(1) should be revised to include libraries on the public notification direct mailing list.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Proposed Subsection (c)(15) (new proposed Subsection (c)(16)) “Sensitive Receptors” has been revised to include libraries. This will add libraries to the public notification direct mailing list.

**35. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

In some cases, where thousands of homes/businesses need to be notified, a sufficient time period is needed to properly identify and confirm the addresses, including sensitive receptors; identify school administrators; determine language needs; reserve a public meeting venue; develop the elements of the plans; and possibly prepare an optional stationary source informational letter. All of these activities will take time, especially for a facility that becomes subject to public notification requirements for the first time. Therefore, proposed Subsection (d)(2) should retain the 45-day time period for submitting the public notification plan as provided in the existing rule.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsection (d)(2) has been revised as suggested.

**36. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The 15-day time period specified in proposed Subsection (d)(2) may not be sufficient for the District to approve a public notification plan. Based on experience, communication between the District and the affected facility may be needed before the plan can be approved, and 15 days may not be sufficient to accomplish this in certain circumstances. Therefore, proposed Subsection (d)(2) should retain the 30-day time period for the District to approve a public notification plan as provided in the existing rule.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsection (d)(2) has been revised as suggested.

**37. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The 15-day time period specified in proposed Subsection (d)(3) is not sufficient to implement the public notification plan in situations where thousands of notifications, some bilingual, may be needed. Some facilities hire mailing services to assist with implementing the plan, in which case, 15 days would not be sufficient to secure a service, provide the addresses, and complete the mailing. Therefore, proposed Subsection (d)(3) should retain the 30-day timeline to implement the public notification plan as provided in the existing rule.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsection (d)(3) has been revised as suggested.

**38. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (d)(5) requires that the public notice be distributed through direct mailing. The District should also distribute public notification materials via other outreach methods, such as email, phone via automated calls and texts, social media, which can be targeted at specific zip codes, and other electronic communication methods.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Despite advances in digital outreach methods, a physical notice mailed to a residence or business or sent home with children enrolled in a neighborhood school is a reliable form of direct notification for the purposes of the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program. The District will consider the use of additional outreach methods for public notification in the future that can be used in addition to the notice sent by mail.

**39. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Public notices should also be posted on the District’s website, along with showing the affected area.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The public notices are currently posted on the District’s website<sup>4</sup>, which includes a map showing the facilities subject to public notification and risk reduction requirements. Additionally, California Assembly Bill 423 (Gloria, 2019) (AB 423) established that by December 2021, the District shall post all records, such as health risk assessments and public notices, on the District’s website.

**40. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The frequency for public notification in proposed Subsection (d)(8) is being revised from biennial to annual. However, even biennial notifications seem to result in very little public interest. Therefore, proposed Subsection (d)(8) should retain the frequency of biennial public notifications as provided in the existing rule.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsection (d)(8) has been revised to require initial public notification and subsequent biennial notifications.

---

<sup>4</sup>[https://www.sdapcd.org/content/sdc/apcd/en/engineering/Permits/Engineering\\_Emissions\\_Inventory/engineering\\_phase2hotspots.html](https://www.sdapcd.org/content/sdc/apcd/en/engineering/Permits/Engineering_Emissions_Inventory/engineering_phase2hotspots.html)



**41. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (d)(9)(i) requires “receipts from the U.S. Postal Service, which describe the boundaries of notification, and addresses included in the mailing...” However, such receipts describing boundaries do not exist. Therefore, the subsection should be revised to specify that proof of distribution shall include “receipts from the U.S. Postal Service *or other postage provider for postage and the addresses included in the mailing...*”

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsections (d)(5) and (d)(9)(i) have been revised as suggested.

**42. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Subsection (d)(1) specifies that public notice shall be distributed via direct mailing to any other sensitive receptor “potentially exposed to such risks.” However, this phrase is too vague. The subsection should be revised to specify the area that requires public notification by utilizing the addresses “*within the isopleth of any cancer risk greater than 10 in one million and/or acute or chronic health risk greater than 1.0*” or a similar requirement.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsection (d)(1) has been revised to “*...within the isopleth exposed to health risks at or above the significant risk threshold(s).*”

**43. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Consistency and accessibility of information via the public notice is critical. Therefore, the District should prepare the public notice.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District currently prepares the public notices and allows facilities to prepare an informational letter to accompany the public notification package. The informational letter shall be prepared in accordance with new proposed Subsection (d)(3)(iv) and must be approved by the District.

**44. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The public notice should include clear and readable maps with isopleths derived from the health risk assessments, and a common language explanation of the health effects of the toxic air contaminant emissions from the chemicals or operations that the community is exposed to.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. New proposed Subsection (d)(2)(iii) has been added to specify that clear and readable maps with isopleths be included with the public notification package.

**45. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The public notice should specify the risk reduction measures that have already been implemented, the additional measures that will be required, and the timeframe for installation of any new equipment or modification of existing operations.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsection (d)(8) has been revised to specify that biennial notifications shall include the status of the risk reduction audit and plan.

**46. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

A public meeting should be convened after a risk reduction audit and plan has been received by the District, and a public comment period for the plan should be provided. The public meeting should provide the community with an update on the progress made and reductions achieved towards reducing the cancer risk to below the proposed 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

New proposed Subsection (e)(3) requires the Air Pollution Control Officer to provide public notice within 30 days after receipt of the risk reduction audit and plan, and to make the plan available for public review to provide for a 30-day comment period. Additionally, a public meeting will be required prior to the consideration of an extension to reduce health risks to below the significant risk threshold(s).

As required by AB 423, all records related to risk reduction audits and plans will be readily available to the public.

**47. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The District should manage all public meetings by developing a standard framework that is required to be used for each meeting.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsection (d)(10) specifies the requirements for conducting public meetings. The District will also develop procedures for public meetings to provide consistency.

**48. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The District should manage critical logistics for a public meeting to help ensure public participation including utilizing a consistent and knowledgeable facilitator, providing interpretation, and providing child care.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Proposed Subsection (d)(10)(ii) specifies that the owner or operator of a stationary source shall make all necessary arrangements for the public meeting including, but not limited to, personnel and interpretation if required. The District will provide oversight to ensure the meeting meets all requirements of the rule, which include adequate outreach for the meeting.

**49. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

If little public interest is assessed for an in-person public meeting, the rule should include the option for a facility to conduct a virtual meeting.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Proposed Subsection (d)(10)(i) provides the option of conducting a virtual public meeting with District approval.

**50. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Public meetings should be conducted in-person with a virtual option, and not virtual only, unless there is a public health order prohibiting in-person meetings.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 49.

**51. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The proposed amendments would require annual notification and annual public meetings for any facility required to provide notification, regardless of the response (or lack thereof) to the notification. These changes will result in many more public meetings being held, including in

situations where there is little or no concern within the notified community. There is considerable expense associated with holding a public meeting, including securing a venue, providing audio-visual and translation capabilities, making facility personnel available, etc. These expenses will be incurred by the facility regardless of how many, if any, people attend the meeting. It does not make sense to impose these costs on facilities regardless of the level of interest in the notified community. Therefore, the District should retain the existing provisions related to the frequency of public notification, and process for determining whether or not a public meeting is warranted.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Proposed Subsection (d)(10) has been revised to require a public meeting for all initial public notifications. A public meeting would be required for subsequent biennial notifications only if applicable as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

**52. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The use of the “meeting on request” postcard system, as currently used by the District, will assist the District and facility to better understand any areas of concern when developing the agenda for the meeting. It will also help to avoid unnecessary expenditures of resources and staff time in conducting meetings that may not have much public attendance. Therefore, the District should retain the use of the postcard system to assess the level of community interest before requiring a public meeting.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Proposed Subsection (d)(3)(ii) specifies that a “Public Response Survey Card” reproduced from originals provided by the District be included with the public notice. This survey card will be used by the District to assess the level of community interest and determine if a public meeting for subsequent biennial notifications is warranted pursuant to proposed Subsection (d)(10).

**53. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Much of the requirements in existing Section (d) Public Notification and Public Meeting Requirements pertaining to the historical basis for triggering a health risk assessment update is proposed to be removed. Section (d) should be revised to include a provision specifying when a health risk assessment or health risk assessment update will be requested.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Proposed Subsection (d)(8) has been revised to specify that the health risk assessment requirement will be based on the most recent prioritization score.

**54. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Will District requests for a risk reduction audit and plan be issued before, during, or after a facility's public notification process? Do proposed rule amendments establish when the District will issue either request relative to approving a health risk assessment? What is the District's rationale for shortening both timelines for facility response? Under the circumstances, it would seem that all parties are embarking on something new and will need more time to comply with the rule requirements.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Per the California Health and Safety Code, Sections 44362(b) and 44391(a), upon approval of the health risk assessment, the District shall notify the facility about the applicable risk reduction and/or public notification requirements. Section 44362(a) of the Health and Safety Code also establishes that within one year the District shall approve a health risk assessment or return it for revision and resubmission.

As it relates to the timelines in Rule 1210, the District had intended to streamline the process in order to minimize any unnecessary delays. However, in consideration of the comments received, proposed Subsections (d)(2), (d)(3) and (e)(1) have been revised to retain the various deadline requirements provided in the existing rule, i.e., 45 days to submit a public notification plan, 30 days for the Air Pollution Control Officer to approve the plan, 30 days to implement the public notification plan, and 180 days to submit a risk reduction audit and plan.

**55. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Depending on the level of risk, a facility may need to hire consultants, consult with control technology vendors, coordinate and consult with the District, seek internal approval of plans and funding, and develop the plan. This is a lengthy process that may take more than the proposed 120 days to submit a risk reduction audit and plan. This is especially the case for large and complex facilities where it may not be feasible to perform all steps necessary to evaluate potential risk reduction measures, including re-running health risk assessments and performing engineering analyses within 120 days. The 6-month timeframe in the existing rule is consistent with the requirements of California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6. Facility Toxic Air Contaminant Risk Reduction Audit and Plan, Section 44391 (f). Therefore, Subsection (e)(1) should retain the 6-month period from the date of notification from the District to submit a risk reduction audit and plan as provided in the existing rule.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsection (e)(1) has been revised to require a risk reduction audit and plan to be submitted within 180 days of written notice from the District.

**56. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (e)(2) provides the District discretion to shorten a facility's 5-year period to reduce risk to below the significant risk thresholds. The proposed 10 in one million cancer risk reduction threshold is so aggressive, and will present challenges related to technology and costs, that this provision is not necessary. Therefore, proposed Subsection (e)(2) should be removed.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Former proposed Subsection (e)(2) has been removed. However, California Health and Safety Code, Section 44391(b) states the following: *“The period to implement the plan required by subdivision (a) may be shortened by the district if it finds that it is technically feasible and economically practicable to implement the plan to reduce emissions below the significant risk level more quickly or if it finds that the emissions from the facility pose an unreasonable health risk.”*

**57. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (e)(2) reduces the time period for which the District may authorize an extension from five to three years. The 5-year extension period provided in the existing rule is consistent with California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6. Facility Toxic Air Contaminant Risk Reduction Audit and Plan, Section 44391(c) to ensure there is sufficient time for new technologies to be developed and demonstrated in the field. Therefore, proposed Subsection (e)(2) should retain the 5-year extension period to reduce risks to below the significant risk thresholds as provided in the existing rule.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Former proposed Subsection (e)(2), which provided the District discretion to shorten a facility's period to reduce risk to below the significant risk thresholds, has been removed. However, the District believes that it is adequate to reevaluate the need for extensions every 3 years.

**58. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (e)(4)(ii) (new proposed Subsection (e)(2)(ii)) requires a facility risk characterization to be included with the risk reduction audit and plan, which includes an updated emissions inventory report and health risk assessment if the risk due to total facility emissions has increased to above or decreased to below the levels indicated in the previously approved health risk assessment. This requirement is not necessary since the risk reduction audit and plan is presumably triggered by a recent health risk assessment and performing another health risk assessment seems redundant and unnecessary. A facility's emissions and risks will vary from year to year based on the normal course of operations. Therefore, proposed Subsection (e)(4)(ii) (new proposed Subsection (e)(2)(ii)) should be revised to require an updated health risk assessment when emissions increase by more than 20% for the pollutants that contribute the most to the estimated health risk.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District disagrees. Owners or operators should use the most recent approved emissions inventory reports and health risk assessments to develop the risk reduction audit and plan.

New proposed Subsection (e)(2)(ii), formerly proposed Subsection (e)(4)(ii), is intended to require emissions and health risks that are representative for when the risk reduction audit and plan is submitted to the District. This is required as facilities might reduce or increase emissions between when the risk reduction audit and plan is requested and when the plan is submitted. It usually takes 2.5 to 3 years between when the toxic emissions occur and when a risk reduction audit and plan is required due to all the regulatory requirements that apply to risk reduction requirements. More specifically, per state law risk reduction requirements apply based on the health risks calculated by health risk assessments, which are required based on emissions of toxic air contaminants calculated by the District. The following table lists all the applicable requirements between the time when the emissions are calculated and a risk reduction audit and plan is requested by the District.

<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Requirement</b>
During Emissions Inventory Year (Year 0)	This is the year for which the District evaluates emissions.
During Subsequent Year (Year 1)	District requests emission data from previous calendar year. Facility submits emission data. District completes emissions calculations. District identifies facilities that may present public health concerns. District requests health risk assessments.
During Following Year (Year 2)	Facilities submit health risk assessments. District submits health risk assessments to OEHHA. OEHHA completes the review of the health risk assessment.
During Following Year (Year 3)	Taking comments from OEHHA into consideration, the District approves or returns for revision and resubmission and then approves, the health risk assessment. District implements applicable public notification and risk reduction requirements.

Therefore, risk reduction audit and plans need to include current emissions and health risks so the District is able to evaluate control techniques that will reduce health risks.

**59. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (e)(4)(vi) ((new proposed Subsection (e)(2)(vi)) should be revised to specify that progress reports shall include the compliance status (e.g., Notice to Comply, Notice of Violation, Variance Petition) and demonstration of the emission units reducing toxic air contaminants and health risk. If there is a variance request for an emission unit identified in a risk

reduction audit and plan, the health risk-based impact should be evaluated not only for the individual emission unit's risk but also for the facility's overall risk.

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Any entities that do not comply with any of the rules or regulations under the District's jurisdiction are subject to compliance action.

Notices to Comply can only be issued for minor violations as established in Rule 6 – Minor Violations. As provided in State law, a Notice of Violation may result in monetary penalties civil suit, or in serious cases, criminal prosecution. California Health and Safety Code specifies maximum penalties for violations of State and District laws, rules, and permits based on level of culpability. In determining the amount assessed and per California Health and Safety Code Section 42403, the District is required to take into consideration all relevant circumstances, including but not limited to: extent of harm, nature and persistence of violation, length of time, frequency of past violations, record of maintenance, unproven/innovative nature of control equipment, action taken to mitigate the violation, and financial burden. There are restrictions for variances that can be granted by the Hearing Board.<sup>5</sup> Variances from State law requirements cannot be granted.

Since the District is responsible for taking enforcement actions, requiring compliance information from facilities is not necessary since the District will have this information. Additionally, AB 423 establishes that all compliance actions will be available to the public on the District's website after December 2021.

### **60. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The Department of the Navy (Navy) is concerned that the restrictive language in the proposed amendments to Rule 1210 implies limited operations at a stationary source at or above the cancer risk reduction threshold (i.e., 10 in one million), even when all technically feasible and economically practicable options have been implemented. Thus, the proposed amendments may limit or stop mission critical operations that support national security and defense.

Given the unique and crucial role of the Navy in support of national security matters and the unknown implications of emission reduction requirements on the Navy's mission critical operations, the Navy requests that a provision be included in the rule to allow for continued mission critical operations on installations where risk reduction audit and plans are required and all technical and economically feasible measures for emission reductions have been implemented, understanding that future technological advancements will allow for additional emission reductions via new production pathways, processes, or application of control technology.

Therefore, the rule should be revised to include a new proposed Subsection (e)(6) as follows: *"In accordance with Health and Safety Code 40100.6(4)(g)(l), the Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO) shall consult with a Department of Navy and where an installation required to submit a*

---

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdc/apcd/PDF/Compliance/APCD\\_Variance\\_Fact\\_Sheet.pdf](https://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdc/apcd/PDF/Compliance/APCD_Variance_Fact_Sheet.pdf)



*risk reduction audit and plan has implemented available technologically and economically feasible steps, military operations will be allowed to continue indefinitely, as required for national security and defense, under an ongoing emissions reduction plan approved by the APCO."*

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The California Health and Safety Code, Section 40100.6(4)(g)(1) states that "*The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District governing board shall consult with the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard on all permitting, rules, regulations, and planning issues that have the potential to impact the mission of the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard.*" This requirement is being met.

Currently, military installations are not subject to the proposed amended rule. If operations at military installations change in the future to the extent that the military installation becomes subject to risk reduction requirements, the proposed amended rule only requires risk reductions to the extent it is technically feasible. Therefore, this proposal will not limit or stop mission critical operations that support national security and defense.

### **61. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Will an expedited review process be available for facilities that are required to submit a risk reduction audit and plan?

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

If the proposed amendments to Rule 1210 are adopted, the District will review each risk reduction audit and plan received as expeditiously as possible. Most of these plans will be submitted to the District through a permit application. The applications for cancer risk reduction will be prioritized by the District.

The District has established timelines for the application process as specified in Rule 18 – Action on Applications, and facilities may request an expedited review process for any application submitted to the District.

### **62. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

If the significant risk threshold is reduced to below 10 in one million for cancer risk, some facilities in San Diego may not be able to reduce their risk to below this level even after implementing all available options in the proposed amended rule, including the granting of an extension. The proposed amended rule should provide an allowance for a facility to continue operating if their cancer risk reduction threshold is equal to or greater than 10 in one million, provided that all "feasible" and "reasonable" risk reduction steps have been implemented.

Therefore, the rule should be revised to include the following provision: *“A stationary source that is required to submit a risk reduction audit and plan and has implemented available technologically feasible and economically practicable options may continue to operate legally, under an ongoing emissions reduction plan approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer, and continue to implement technologically feasible and economically practicable measures to reduce their risks as these measures become available.”*

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District disagrees. Proposed Subsections (e)(4) and (e)(5) include provisions for extensions. If it is not technically feasible to reduce health risks, facilities can apply for subsequent extensions. If the District approves these extensions, facilities may continue to operate even if their health risk has not been reduced to below the proposed cancer risk reduction threshold.

### **63. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The proposed amended rule does not specify the enforcement actions that the District may take in the event of non-compliance with the deadlines included in the risk reduction audit and plan and any extensions of time granted by the District. Additional language should be included to specify the penalties for non-compliance, and/or referenced if they are included in other rules.

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District disagrees. Any entities that do not comply with any of the rules or regulations under the District’s jurisdiction are subject to compliance actions. State law requires the District to take enforcement actions when it documents a violation.

As provided in State law, a Notice of Violation may result in monetary penalties, civil suit, or in serious cases, criminal prosecution. The California Health and Safety Code specifies maximum penalties for violations of State and District laws, and rules and permits based on level of culpability. Additionally, Health and Safety Code section 44381 prescribes civil penalties for specified violations related to the Hot Spots program. In determining the amount assessed and per California Health and Safety Code Section 42403, the District is required to take into consideration all relevant circumstances, including, but not limited to: extent of harm, nature and persistence of violation, length of time, frequency of past violations, record of maintenance, unproven/innovative nature of control equipment, action taken to mitigate the violation, and financial burden.

Since noncompliance with any of the rules or regulations under the District’s jurisdiction may result in compliance actions, it is not necessary to include potential enforcement actions in the proposed amended rule.

**64. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

If a determination of technical infeasibility is made which limits the emission reductions in the risk reduction audit and plan, an updated technology review must be conducted annually, and findings must be included in the plan and/or updates requiring additional action by the facility.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District disagrees. The District believes that annual technology review would not result in significant benefits. If an extension request is submitted, it will be evaluated under a permit application. District Rule 18 – Action on Applications allows up to 180 days for the review of permit applications. The District believes that it will need time to carefully review the risk reduction audit and plan, and determine if it meets the proposed amended rule requirements.

To promote transparency, the District is proposing to conduct a public meeting prior to consideration of a request for an extension. At the request of the Air Pollution Control Officer, a public meeting may also be conducted prior to approving a risk reduction audit and plan.

**65. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

How will the proposed amendments improve public health?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

See District Response to Workshop Comment No. 27.

**66. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The District must provide data to support that air toxic emissions cause cancers, and that lowering the cancer risk reduction threshold will decrease the incidence of cancer in an affected area.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

As stated under District Response to Comment No. 27, toxic compounds have been extensively studied by toxicologists, doctors, and other medical health experts who have determined that these compounds are cancer causing agents. OEHHA has extensive health data demonstrating that pollutants created by facilities subject to Rule 1210 contribute to cancer risk.

Rule 1210 was adopted in 1996 to establish public notification and cancer risk reduction thresholds and procedures in response to the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program, which was designed to quantify toxic air contaminants from stationary sources and evaluate the potential public health impacts of those emissions. Rule 1210 is intended to reduce cancer risk, as opposed to cancer rate.

Lowering the cancer risk reduction threshold will decrease the cancer risk in San Diego County. Currently, facilities emitting toxic air contaminants that contribute to cancer risk do not need to reduce the risk until it is equal to or above 100 in one million. That is, for every 1,000,000 people exposed to the toxic emissions created by a facility, 100 people might develop cancer. This threshold is inefficient for San Diego County as there are no facilities in the region that create a cancer risk equal to or above 100 in one million. This proposal includes requiring facilities to decrease the cancer risk created by their emissions when the risk is equal to or above 10 in one million, which will be effective for the region as multiple facilities currently exceed the proposed 10 in one million threshold.

**67. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The term “public” is proposed for removal throughout the rule. Because the Division of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) protects and improves the health and safety of workers in California through setting and enforcing standards, issuing permits, licenses, certifications, registrations, and approvals, the term “public” should be retained in the rule to clarify that the rule addresses general public safety exclusive of occupational safety.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District disagrees. The term “public” is proposed for removal from the rule because, in accordance with OEHHA guidelines and Rule 1210, the health risks from worker exposure is calculated.

**68. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

CARB conducted an economic analysis for the Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) for Stationary Compression Ignition Engines. Can a similar analysis be done for Rule 1210?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Yes, the District is publishing a Socioeconomic Impact Assessment. It’s important to note that the ATCM is specific for stationary diesel engines only. The Socioeconomic Impact Assessment prepared for proposed amended Rule 1210 will differ from the analysis for the ATCM due to the variability in the emission source types (e.g., engines, spraying operations) and the primary toxic compounds that contribute to facility-wide estimated cancer risk.

**69. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

If two facilities have similar estimated cancer risks, they could potentially have vastly different costs to implement their respective risk reduction measures.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

There may be considerable cost differences between facilities due to the variability in the types of risk reduction measures that may be considered. The owner or operator of an affected facility shall, at their discretion, first determine the specific risk reduction measures to include in their proposed risk reduction audit and plan, and then the District will evaluate the plan to ensure it meets the requirements in Rule 1210 and will be implemented as expeditiously as possible.

**70. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Are financial resources available to help facilities offset the potential costs to comply with the proposed lowering of the cancer risk reduction threshold?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

No, but cost is considered under the T-BARCT definition. The proposed amended rule does not apply to small businesses.

**71. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

To date, the District has not conducted or circulated a Socioeconomic Impact Assessment for public review (California Health and Safety Code Section 40728.5) even though the proposed amendments are scheduled to come before the Governing Board in less than 60 days. This means that the District's decision to propose a 10 in one million significant risk threshold is completely uninformed by any understanding of the socioeconomic impacts associated with that proposal.

The District has not considered the enormous cost the proposed amendments will impose upon facilities in order to implement measures in an effort to reduce their MICR to below 10 in one million, particularly in such a short period of time for compliance. To reach this lower threshold, or attempt to do so, facilities will likely need to engage in costly changes, including changes to production processes, feed stock modifications, product reformulations, production system modifications, system enclosures or relocations within the facility, emissions capture, and modifications to operational standards or practices. The District has considered none of this or how the costs to facilities will be compounded by such a short period of time to comply. Nor has the District considered the ripple effects that these increased costs of compliance may have on the price of goods and services provided by the affected companies, and the impacts on employment and the broader economy.

During the public workshop on August 5, 2021, the District suggested that some facilities can reduce their MICR by implementing changes that involve little or no cost, such as relocating operations within the facility. Relocating operations may or may not be a low-cost proposition, depending on the nature and size of the operations and the facility. Furthermore, even if the assertion that some facilities may have low costs of compliance is accurate, that does not mean that other facilities will not have high costs of compliance, and it certainly does not absolve the

District from its statutory obligation to evaluate the socioeconomic impacts of the proposed amendments.

The District has also suggested that conducting a Socioeconomic Impact Assessment for the proposed amendments is difficult because staff does not now know what steps facilities will take to reduce their MICR. California Health and Safety Code Section 40728.5 does not relieve districts from conducting a Socioeconomic Impact Assessment on the basis that doing so may be complicated. Furthermore, it is unclear why conducting the assessment in this case would be particularly complicated. The District has identified a relatively small number of facilities that it believes currently have an MICR above 10 in one million. The District has detailed health risk assessments for each of those facilities, and any necessary information is easily obtainable by reaching out to the regulated community and conducting site visits. Therefore, it does not appear particularly complicated to make assumptions about the control measures that each facility is likely to implement and the costs associated therewith. If the District needs additional information related to costs, then it should solicit that information from the affected facilities as is frequently done in air district rulemakings.

Once completed, the Socioeconomic Impact Assessment should be subject to independent third-party review by a reputable firm with expertise in conducting socioeconomic analysis. The final assessment must also be circulated for public review and comment. Finally, the District should reassess the proposed amendments in light of the results of the Socioeconomic Impact Assessment.

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District will publish a Socioeconomic Impact Assessment even though it is not required by the California Health and Safety Code, and it will be in compliance with all the applicable California Health and Safety Code mandates related to this rulemaking process.

### **72. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

California Health and Safety Code Section 40703 requires air districts adopting any regulation to “consider, pursuant to Section 40922, and make available to the public, its findings related to the cost-effectiveness of a control measure, as well as the basis for the findings and the considerations involved.” To date, the District has not undertaken any effort to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of control measures that facilities might be required to implement if the proposed amendments were adopted. When asked about this issue during the August 5, 2021 workshop, the District responded that toxics rules, such as the proposed amendments, do not lend themselves to the typical cost-effectiveness analysis used for criteria pollutants, because doing so would necessarily require the district to assign a dollar value to health outcomes avoided.

Even if the distinction suggested by the District was valid, that would not eliminate the need to assess the cost-effectiveness of the proposed amendments pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 40703. Furthermore, the distinction is not valid. Air districts, including the District, regularly elect not to adopt best available retrofit control (BARCT) standards limiting emissions of criteria pollutants that exceed a specified cost-effectiveness threshold. In doing so, the District

is making a decision that the additional adverse health outcomes that might be avoided by imposing a more stringent standard that exceeds the cost-effectiveness threshold do not justify the additional costs of the more stringent standard. The analysis is no different here.

In fact, the proposed amendments already include this concept in proposed Subsection (c)(2) “Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT),” which includes any emissions limitation or retrofit control technique found by the District to be technically feasible “taking into consideration the cost of achieving health risk reductions,” among other things. Thus, the proposed amendments already acknowledge that the cost of achieving health risk reductions is a factor that can and should be taken into consideration with establishing toxic air contaminant emission standards.

Not only has the District failed to conduct a cost-effectiveness analysis for the proposed amendments, it has not proposed any mechanism in the rule that would preclude the need to implement control measures that are demonstrably not cost-effective. The only limitations are that the control measures be technically feasible and “economically practicable.” It is entirely conceivable that there could be very costly control measures that are technically feasible and “economically practicable,” but which produce little or no risk reduction. The District conceded during the August 5, 2021 workshop that some risk reduction measures may not result in any emission reductions. It would be inconsistent with the California Health and Safety Code’s mandates, and indeed absurd, to require a facility modification that has de minimis reduction in risk but costs millions of dollars to implement. And, because of the tenfold decrease in the MICR significant risk threshold, far more facilities will be affected and required to reduce their estimated cancer risk.

The District must evaluate the relative costs and benefits of lowering the cancer risk reduction threshold from 100 in one million to 10 in one million, as well as other interim alternatives such as 50 in one million and 25 in one million. In addition, the District must provide in the rule a mechanism for screening out control measures that do not result in risk reduction commensurate with the cost of implementation.

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District is complying with all mandates applicable to this rulemaking process, including the Socioeconomic Impact Assessment. As stated under District Response to Comment No. 27, the District has carefully evaluated other cancer risk reduction thresholds. The definition of and references to the term “economically practicable” have been removed from the proposed amended rule. Facilities that are unable to reduce their cancer risks to below 10 in one million in 5 years might be eligible for extensions based on implementation of T-BARCT and all technically feasible measures.

**73. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The District should outline its plans to manage the expected increase in workload associated with the additional health risk assessments, public notifications, and risk reduction audit and plans that will be required by the proposed amended rule. Specifically, the report should specify how facilities will be treated consistently and equitably.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The only change that will slightly increase the number of facilities subject to Rule 1210 is the proposed lowering of the cancer risk reduction threshold. This change would only affect up to 26 facilities in San Diego County. For context, the District regulates over 4,000 facilities. For this reason, the District does not expect a significant workload increase associated with this proposal.

**74. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

CARB recently adopted amendments to their Emission Inventory Criteria and Guidelines Regulation (EICG Regulation), which included the adoption of an additional 700+ toxic air contaminants, and the use of total particulate matter (PM) rather than PM10 as is the current practice. How will these amendments to the EICG Regulation apply to additional facilities and impact those that have reduced their emissions?

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

There is no information on the health risk values for all of these additional compounds. Consequently, the impact on a facility's estimated cancer and noncancer risks cannot be determined at this time.

**75. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Rule 1210 should be revised to include provisions regarding the preparation of toxic emissions inventories, the process for calculating prioritization scores, and criteria for determining that a health risk assessment will be required.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District disagrees. The suggested revision is not necessary because the requirements for emissions inventories and prioritization scores are specified in other regulations or procedures.

The EICG Regulation provides directions for facilities to compile and submit air toxic emission data to local districts. The requirements within the EICG Regulation have been incorporated by reference into Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations and thus are enforceable by air districts and CARB.



The prioritization procedure is specified in the District's Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program Prioritization Procedures, January 2017. Each stationary source prioritization score is evaluated individually and placed in either Category A (high priority), Category B (intermediate priority) or Category C (low priority) based upon the total score and thresholds. Sources categorized as "high" are subject to health risk assessment requirements. Sources categorized as "intermediate" may be subject to health risk assessment requirements based on additional factors or further evaluation. Facilities categorized as "low" are not subject to health risk assessment requirements.

**76. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The term "potential" is proposed for removal throughout the rule. While toxic emissions modeled in health risk assessments are estimated as "actual" emissions, current rule references describing risk itself as "potential" should remain as such. The word "potential" is inherent to Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act (AB 2588) and appropriate for describing risk. Therefore, the term "potential" should be retained in the rule.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District disagrees. The cancer and noncancer risks referenced in the rule are estimated risks, which infers potential risks. Therefore, the tandem use of the terms "potential" and "estimated" is redundant, and accordingly the term "potential" is proposed for removal throughout the rule.

**77. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), all public agencies must give careful, deliberate consideration to preventing environmental damage. Thus, when a public agency must issue a discretionary approval for a proposed project, CEQA requires disclosure of the project's significant environmental impacts and mitigation or avoidance of those impacts where feasible prior to agency approval. To do so, the agency must follow procedures that the Legislature has established to achieve CEQA's goals, chiefly through the development and certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The EIR is the very heart of CEQA.

Here, the proposed amendments are undisputedly a "project" under CEQA. CEQA defines a project as an "activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment." CEQA projects include an agency's adoption of a rule or regulation, including those aimed at environmental protection. Despite this, the District has conducted no environmental analysis whatsoever. The District has offered no explanation of the proposed amendments' potential significant environmental impacts, and its failure to do so is a violation of CEQA.

Implementation of control measures to comply with the proposed amendments will produce potentially significant impacts, including construction emissions, water quality impacts associated with paving to reduce fugitive emissions, new or additional hazardous materials used at facilities,

utility impacts associated with increased electricity consumption, etc. All of these potential impacts must be analyzed and disclosed to the public.

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District will complete an environmental review of proposed amendments to Rule 1210. However, Rule 1210 does not specify the actions affected facilities will take to comply with the rule. The types of facilities in San Diego County which may be affected by the amended rule are mineral processing, shipbuilding, landfills, sewage treatment, Turbine Repair and Testing, hospitals, power plants and a university and scientific research facility. These types of facilities currently have permits with the District, but it is not known which actions each facility will take to comply. The potential actions they take include installing control devices or modifying their operations. The list of potential control devices that may be installed are baghouses, carbon adsorption and oxidation catalysts, enclosures with HEPA filters or diesel particulate filters or diesel oxidation catalysts. Adding these types of control devices will require a modification of their District permit to operate. A facility may also choose to modify their operation by paving haul roads, using soil stabilizers, increased watering of haul roads or by limiting their hours of operation. These types of operational changes would also be reflected in a facility's permit to operate. A facility specific CEQA review will be conducted during permit modification to determine if proposed actions to comply with Rule 1210 could result in an environmental impact.

### **78. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

California Health and Safety Code Section 40725 requires the District to provide public notification to potentially affected parties. The backlog of unapproved health risk assessments means that the District cannot possibly know the full implications of the proposed amendments. Therefore, adequate public notification cannot be provided because the District does not know how many facilities will be affected. Furthermore, even if a facility has been notified, it cannot evaluate the potential implications of the proposed amendments if its health risk assessment has not been fully reviewed by the District. There can be no meaningful opportunity for participation in the rulemaking process for facilities that cannot know what, if any, affect the proposed amendments will have on their operations.

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District has carefully evaluated the impact of this proposal on the facilities under its jurisdiction. Specifically, the District has quantified the toxic air contaminants from all facilities subject to the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program through the 2019 calendar year. The District has also identified the facilities that might create elevated health risks and required health risk assessments, which quantify the health risks. In accordance with State law, health risk assessments are conducted by the facilities, reviewed by OEHHA, and approved by the District. Under this evaluation the District identified up to 26 facilities that might be subject to the proposed lowering of the cancer risk reduction threshold. For context, the District evaluated approximately 400 facilities under its jurisdiction (in San Diego County) and, out of the 400 facilities evaluated, it identified up to 26 facilities that might be affected by this proposal.

## **79. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

California Health and Safety Code Section 40727 requires that the District make certain findings before adopting or amending a rule, including findings of necessity, authority, clarity, consistency, nonduplication, and reference. California Health and Safety Code Section 40727.2 requires that the District prepare a written analysis, as specified therein, to support the findings required by Section 40727. The District has not provided sufficient evidence to support the required findings, and certainly has not done so in writing.

The District has not provided support required to reach the conclusion that these amendments are necessary. “Necessity” means that a need exists for the regulation, or for its amendment or repeal, as demonstrated by the record of the rulemaking authority.” During the August 5 workshop, the District generally asserted that reducing the MICR significant risk threshold to below 10 in one million would “reduce risks” and that it would align with the public notification requirement. But the District has not provided any analysis to support the first assertion or to explain why it is necessary to align cancer risk reduction thresholds with notification thresholds. Notably, other air districts, including the South Coast AQMD, have alternative thresholds for notification and risk reduction. Nor has the District shown why it is necessary to increase public notifications from biennial to annual or mandate annual public meetings rather than at the discretion of the Air Pollution Control Officer.

As indicated in the 2018 Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program Report for San Diego County prepared by the District, the stationary sources subject to Rule 1210 account for only 2.3% of the toxic air contaminant emissions in San Diego County (See Ex. B). Since the stationary sources subject to Rule 1210 make such a small contribution to total emissions, it is highly questionable that further restrictions on these sources will have a material impact on reducing risk in San Diego County. This brings into question the necessity for the proposed amendments.

## **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District has and will comply with all the California Health and Safety Code mandates as it relates to this rulemaking process. The findings required by Section 40727 are required to be made prior to rule adoption.

Please see District Response to Workshop Comment No. 27 for an explanation of why this change is necessary.

District Rule 1210 was adopted to establish public notification and cancer risk reduction thresholds in response to the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program, which only applies to stationary sources. Additionally, there is a difference between emission and health risks. Facilities can decrease their emissions and increase the health risks. It’s also critical to highlight the scientific data established by OEHHA, which develops health-protective exposure levels for contaminants in air as guidance for regulatory agencies and the public. These include both cancer potency factors<sup>6</sup> and non-cancer

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/CPFs042909.pdf>

reference exposure levels<sup>7</sup> for the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program. Therefore, there is scientific data demonstrating that toxic contaminants emitted by facilities subject to Rule 1210 contribute to an increased cancer risk.

## **80. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

The District has proposed to bring the proposed amendments before the Air Pollution Control District Governing Board (Governing Board) at its October meeting. It is not possible for the District to complete the rulemaking process in a manner that complies with applicable legal requirements within the proposed timeframe.

First, the District has provided very little information related to its rule development process. Given the lack of details and documentation provided to the public regarding the rationale and support for the Proposed Amendments, on August 5, 2021, NASSCO submitted to the District a request for public records, requesting access to specified public records under the Public Records Act, Government Code Section 6250, et seq. (PRA Request). The PRA Request sought, among other things, documents, communications, and comments related to development of proposed amendments to Rule 1210, Rule 1210 meetings and workshops, and the District’s decision to initiate amendments to Rule 1210. These documents should all be readily available to the public as part of the rulemaking process. The District must build time into the process to collect and disclose these documents and provide the public with an opportunity to review them.

Second, the District must complete a number of statutorily required reviews and analysis, including the Socioeconomic Impact Assessment and the CEQA review. It is not clear when those materials will be released for public review, and there must be ample time for the affected facilities and the general public to review and comment on them.

Third, according to the District’s website, the District has requested a number of facilities to complete a health risk assessment. Many of these health risk assessments are still pending evaluation by the District. With such a large number of outstanding facilities, it is impossible for the District to fully assess the impacts of the proposed amendments. The District must complete its review of all of the pending health risk assessments prior to proceedings with the rulemaking process.

Based on the foregoing, an extension of at least six months appears to be warranted, and perhaps longer depending on how long it takes the District to complete and disseminate the required information and analysis.

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://oehha.ca.gov/air/air-toxics-hot-spots>

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District is proposing to present this proposal to its Governing Board on November 4, 2021. The District will continue to meet all California Health and Safety Code mandates related to this proposal and has provided all responsive documents that are not exempt from disclosure in response to the PRA submitted.

The District will publish the workshop report, Socioeconomic Impact Assessment and environmental review prior to the hearing.

The District has carefully evaluated the impact of this proposal on the facilities under its jurisdiction. Specifically, the District has quantified the toxic air contaminants from all facilities subject to the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program through the 2019 calendar year. The District has also identified the facilities that might create elevated health risks and required health risk assessment, which quantify the health risks. In accordance with State law, health risk assessments are conducted by the facilities, reviewed by OEHHA, and approved by the District. Under this evaluation the District identified up to 26 facilities that might be subject to the proposed lowering of the cancer risk reduction threshold. For context the District evaluated a total of approximately 400 facilities under its jurisdiction (in San Diego County) and, out of the 400 facilities evaluated, it identified up to 26 facilities that might be affected by this proposal. Although some health risk assessments conducted by facilities are pending District approval, if the facilities conducted the health risks assessment utilizing the OEHHA methodologies and the emissions under the emissions inventory approved by the Districts, the health risk calculated by the health risk assessment conducted by the facilities should be accurate.

The District disagrees that additional time is required for this rulemaking process.

### **81. WORKSHOP COMMENT**

How can the public communicate support for the proposed rule amendments?

### **DISTRICT RESPONSE**

Written comments may be submitted to the Governing Board by using the form under the “Submit Written Public Comments Here” section on the following webpage:

<https://www.sdapcd.org/content/sdc/apcd/en/apcd-cob-agendas-and-meeting-materials-.html>.

If the public wishes to submit written materials for submission into the record, or have an attachment to the comment, the comment may be sent via email to:

[APCDPublicComment@sdcountry.ca.gov](mailto:APCDPublicComment@sdcountry.ca.gov), or sent via U.S. Mail to 10124 Old Grove Road, San Diego, CA 92131.

Comments received prior to the start of the meeting will be distributed to the Governing Board and posted online with the meeting materials. Comments received after the start of the meeting but before the item is called will be submitted into the written record for the corresponding agenda

item. Materials submitted via U.S. Mail will need to be received the business day prior in order for it to be distributed to the Governing Board.

The Governing Board meeting is scheduled for November 4, 2021, at 1:30 p.m., to consider proposed amended Rule 1210.

**82. CARB COMMENT**

The Purpose suggests that the rule directly specifies limits for maximum individual cancer risk, cancer burden, and total acute and chronic noncancer health hazard indexes which are defined in the term “Significant Risk Threshold.” For clarification, the Purpose should be revised to reference significant risk threshold as follows:

*“...health hazard indexes through the determination of a significant risk threshold applicable to total stationary source emissions and by requiring stationary sources to implement public notifications and health risk reduction plans, and conduct public meetings, to achieve specified health risk threshold limits, as required by the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Information and Assessment Act (AB 2588) and District Rule 1210.”*

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The proposed “Purpose” has been removed.

**83. CARB COMMENT**

Subsection (d)(1) specifies that public notice shall be by direct mailing to any other sensitive receptor potentially exposed to such risks as specified by the Air Pollution Control Officer. The subsection should be revised to include reference elements or criteria to be considered by the District to determine how other sensitive receptors will receive such designation.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

A definition of “Sensitive Receptors” has been included in new proposed Subsection (c)(16). The definition includes hospitals, healthcare facilities (e.g., community clinics), schools, day care facilities, elderly housing and convalescent facilities, libraries, and other facilities where the occupants are more susceptible to the adverse effects of exposure to toxic air contaminants. The term “sensitive receptor” is intended to identify facilities where more susceptible members of the community, e.g., children, elderly, and those who are infirm, may be exposed. However, the term cannot be all inclusive, and thus warrants District discretion in identifying facilities that are not specified in new proposed Subsection (c)(16) “Sensitive Receptors.”

**84. CARB COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (d)(2)(vii) (new proposed Subsection (d)(2)(viii)) specifies that a list of the primary languages spoken by non-English speaking persons in the area to receive notification where such language is the primary language of 5% or more of the total persons to be notified in any census tract in the area to receive notification. The subsection should be revised to include reference for the source of information used to determine those primary languages spoken by non-English speaking persons in the area to receive notification.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District disagrees. Facilities use the latest census to determine the primary language(s) spoken at home on a census tract basis, and if any language is 5% or more of the total persons to be notified, that language(s) is included in the public notifications.

**85. CARB COMMENT**

Proposed Subsection (d)(2)(viii) (new proposed Subsection (d)(2)(xi)) specifies that the public notification plan shall include a proposed method for responding to public comments and requests. The subsection should be revised such that a timeline and due date are to be included in the proposed method for responding to public comments and requests.

**DISTRICT RESPONSE**

The District agrees. Proposed Subsection (d)(2)(viii) (new proposed Subsection (d)(2)(ix)) has been revised as suggested.

AMF:RC:jl  
10/05/21

**Attachment - List of Facilities Potentially Affected by Proposed Amended Rule 1210**  
(current as of 10/5/2021)

<b>Emission Inventory Year</b>	<b>Facility Name</b>	<b>Facility ZIP Code</b>	<b>Estimated cancer risk Reported by Health Risk Assessment Conducted by Facility</b>
2013	BAE Systems	92113	<b>11.8<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	BAE Systems	92113	<b>10.5</b>
2018	CA Commercial Asphalt Enterprises	92145	Pending
2019	CA Commercial Asphalt Enterprises	92040	Pending
2013	Canyon Rock	92120	<b>12.4<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	Canyon Rock	92120	Pending
2016	Chromalloy - San Diego	92121	0.08
2016	City of San Diego -Public Utilities Department	92121	5.25
2017	City of San Diego/Miramar Landfill	92111	<b>19.5<sup>b</sup></b>
2017	Encina Wastewater Authority	92011	4.16
2013	General Dynamics NASSCO	92113	<b>53<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	General Dynamics NASSCO	92113	<b>53<sup>a</sup></b>
2018	Grossmont District Hospital	91942	Pending
2017	Hanson Aggregates	92145	3.30
2019	Hanson Aggregates Pacific Southwest Region	92071	1.69
2018	Kaiser Foundation Hospitals	92120	0.69
2018	Minnesota Methane LLC San Diego Miramar Facility	92111	0.22
2013	Otay Landfill Inc	91911	<b>32.95<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	Otay Landfill Inc	91911	7.6
2019	Pacific Ship Repair & Fabrication Inc	92113	<b>63.4</b>
2019	Robertsons	92154	1.7
2019	Robertsons	92121	3.8
2015	Salk Institute	92037	7.86
2019	Salk Institute	92037	7.86
2017	San Diego County – Pub Wks San Marcos Landfill	92078	7.00 <sup>a</sup>
2017	San Diego State University	92182	9.4
2018	San Marcos Energy LLC	92078	0.11
2019	Superior Ready Mix LP	92025	2.3
2016	Sycamore Energy LLC	92071	0.02
2019	Sycamore Energy LLC	92071	0.02
2013	Sycamore Landfill Inc	92071	<b>38.3<sup>a</sup></b>
2017	Sycamore Landfill Inc	92071	<b>11.3</b>
2017	Vulcan Materials Western Division	92126	0.4

Notes

1. This list includes all facilities that were required to conduct a health risk assessment based on their potential estimated cancer risk and may be affected by revisions to cancer risk reductions thresholds under Rule 1210.



Workshop Report  
Rule 1210

2. This list includes the potential estimated cancer risks that were reported by the health risk assessment conducted by the facility. Per state law, all health risk assessments must be reviewed and approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer.
3. Calculated estimated cancer risks with (a) have been reviewed and approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer.
4. Potential estimated cancer risks in **bold** are greater than 10, based on information currently available.
5. Facilities that have "pending" under the "estimated cancer risk" have a future deadline to submit the health risk assessment or are subject to enforcement actions for not submitting a health risk assessment to the Air Pollution Control Officer in accordance with State law.
6. (b) Based on revised health risk assessment.
7. This list of potentially affected facilities is subject to change as more recent health risk assessments are evaluated and approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

**RULE 1210. TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS –  
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND RISK REDUCTION**

~~(Adopted & Effective 6/12/96) (Rev. Adopted & Effective (date of adoption))~~

~~(Tables I, II, III-Toxic Air Contaminants: Rev. Effective 7/11/17)~~

~~(Table II-Toxic Air Contaminants: Rev. Effective 7/19/18)~~

~~(Table I\_- Toxic Air Contaminants: Rev. Effective 5/29/19-(date of adoption))~~

~~(Tables II, III -\_Toxic Air Contaminants: Rev. Effective 9/29/20-(date of adoption))~~

~~(Table III -\_Toxic Air Contaminants: Rev. Effective 2/26/21-(date of adoption))~~

~~PURPOSE: The purpose of this rule is to reduce the health risk associated with emissions of toxic air contaminants from existing stationary sources by specifying limits for maximum individual cancer risk, cancer burden, and total acute and chronic noncancer health hazard indexes applicable to total stationary source emissions and by requiring stationary sources to implement public notifications and health risk reduction plans, and conduct public meetings, to achieve specified health risk limits, as required by the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Information and Assessment Act (AB 2588) and this rule.~~

**(a) APPLICABILITY**

This rule is applicable to each existing stationary source required to prepare a public health risk assessment, as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer pursuant to the priority system and procedures set out in, ~~under the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Information and Assessment Act (AB 2588)~~ pursuant to Section 44360 of the California Health and Safety Code.

**(b) EXEMPTIONS**

The provisions of Sections (d) Public Notification and Public Meeting Requirements and Section (e) Risk Reduction Audits and Plans of this rule shall not apply to stationary sources for which industry-wide generic public-health risk assessments are prepared by the Air Pollution Control Officer pursuant to Section 44323 of the California Health and Safety Code.

**(c) DEFINITIONS**

(1) **"Airborne Toxic Risk Reduction Measure(s)"** means physical or operational changes changes or control measures implemented at a stationary source that reduce or eliminate toxic air contaminant emissions subject to this rule and

associated health risks, whose reductions are real, permanent, quantifiable, and enforceable through District permits or permit conditions. Airborne toxic risk reduction measures may include changes in production processes, feed stock modifications, product reformulations, production system modifications, system enclosures or relocations within the facility, removal from service, emissions capture, emissions control, emissions conversion, or modifications to operational standards or practices. Airborne toxic risk reduction measures do not include measures which will result in an increased health risk to the public from exposures to the toxic chemical in another media, ~~nor which will result in an increased health risk to stationary source workers or the consumer.~~

(2) **"Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Toxics (T-BARCT)"** means the most effective emission limitation, or retrofit emission control device or control technique, which:

- (i) has been achieved in practice for that source or category of source; or
- (ii) is any other emissions limitation or retrofit control technique found by the Air Pollution Control Officer to be technically feasible for that source or category of source, or for a specific source, while taking into consideration the cost of achieving health risk reductions, any non-air quality health and environmental impacts, and energy requirements. ~~If there is an applicable MACT standard, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall evaluate it for equivalency with T-BARCT.~~

(23) **"Cancer Burden"** means the estimated ~~potential~~ increase in the occurrence of cancer cases in a population subject to an ~~incremental~~ individual cancer risk of equal to or greater than one in one million resulting from exposure to toxic air contaminants.

(3) **"Contiguous Property"** means the same as defined in Rule 2 of these Rules and Regulations.

(4) **"Economically Practicable"** ~~means whether, and to what extent, the annualized cost of the airborne toxic risk reduction measures necessary to reduce the health risk to below the significant risk threshold(s) is not more than 10% of the annual profits of a facility or 1% of the annual operational budget of a non-profit facility.~~

(454) **"Emissions Inventory Report"** means a document that identifies and describes sources of toxic air contaminant emissions at a stationary source,

characterizes the nature of the discharge of such contaminants, and ~~estimates~~ quantifies the types and amounts of toxic air contaminants emitted from each source.

(5) **"Emissions Inventory Year"** means the year in which the emissions occurred and for which an emissions inventory is required pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 44340 et seq.

~~(56)~~ **"Emission Unit"** means the same as defined in Rule 2 – Definitions. ~~means any article, machine, equipment, contrivance, process or process line which emits or may emit one or more toxic air contaminants.~~

(7) **"Health Risk Assessment"** means ~~a study to identify, characterize and quantify the estimated cancer and noncancer health risks that may result from public exposure to emissions of toxic air contaminants emitted from one or more emission units at a stationary source~~ a detailed comprehensive analysis prepared pursuant to Section 44361 of the California Health and Safety Code to evaluate and predict the dispersion of hazardous substances in the environment and the potential for exposure of human populations and to assess and quantify both the individual and population wide health risks associated with those levels of exposure.

(68) **"Individual Substance Acute Health Hazard Index"** means, for each air contaminant, the ratio of the maximum estimated concentration of that contaminant in the ambient air for the specified averaging time for a given ~~potential~~ acute health effect to the applicable reference exposure level for that contaminant for the same averaging time.

(79) **"Individual Substance Chronic Health Hazard Index"** means, for each air contaminant, the ratio of the maximum estimated concentration of that contaminant in the ambient air for the specified averaging time for a given ~~potential~~ chronic health effect to the applicable reference exposure level for that contaminant for the same averaging time.

(810) **~~"Industry-Wide Generic Public Health Risk Assessment"~~** means a study to identify, characterize, and quantify the ~~potential public~~ health risks that may result from emissions of toxic air contaminants from a class of stationary sources which the Air Pollution Control Officer finds meets all of the following:

- (i) All stationary sources within the class fall within one four-digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code.

(ii) Individual preparation of emission inventory reports and public health risk assessments would impose severe economic hardships on the majority of stationary sources within the class.

(iii) The majority of the class is composed of small businesses.

(iv) Releases of toxic air contaminants from individual stationary sources in the class can easily and generically be characterized and calculated.

(11) "Isopleth" means the boundaries of the area that is exposed to health risks at or above the significant risk threshold(s).

~~(11) "Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT)" means the same as defined in Rule 1200 - Toxic Air Contaminants - New Source Review.~~

(912) ~~"Maximum Incremental Individual Cancer Risk" means the estimated probability of a potential maximally exposed individual contracting cancer as a result of exposure to toxic air contaminants emitted from a stationary source.~~

~~(40) "Prioritization Score" means a value indicative of a stationary source's toxic air contaminant emissions strength, arrived at by use of emissions data contained in an approved emission inventory report, air contaminant toxicity data recommended by the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, and a calculation methodology established by the Air Pollution Control Officer. Separate prioritization scores are determined for toxic air contaminants with the potential for causing carcinogenic effects, noncarcinogenic acute effects, and noncarcinogenic chronic effects.~~

(13) "Prioritization Score" means a value indicative of a stationary source's toxic air contaminant emissions strength, arrived at by utilizing emissions data contained in an approved emission inventory report, air contaminant toxicity data recommended by the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, and a calculation methodology established by the Air Pollution Control Officer. Separate prioritization scores are determined for toxic air contaminants with the potential for causing carcinogenic effects, noncarcinogenic acute effects, and noncarcinogenic chronic effects.

~~(41) "Public Health Risk Assessment" means a study to identify, characterize and quantify the estimated potential cancer and noncancer public health risks that may result from public exposure to emissions of toxic air contaminants emitted from one or more emission units at a stationary source.~~

~~(121314)~~ **"Risk Reduction Audit and Plan"** means a study prepared by the owner or operator, or representative, of a stationary source which identifies sources and emissions of toxic air contaminants at the stationary source that contribute to the exceedance result ~~in potentially of the significant public health risks~~ threshold(s) and which proposes airborne toxic risk reduction measures that are sufficient to reduce ~~potential public health risks from such emissions to less than significant risk mitigation levels as specified in this rule~~ below the significant risk threshold(s).

~~(131415)~~ **"School"** means any public or private school used for the education of more than 12 children in one or more grades from ~~kindergarten-preschool~~ through grade 12, but does not include any school in which education is primarily conducted in a private home.

~~(1516)~~ **"Sensitive Receptors"** include hospitals, healthcare facilities (e.g., community clinics) schools, day care facilities, elderly housing and convalescent facilities, libraries, and other facilities where the occupants are more susceptible to the adverse effects of exposure to toxic air contaminants, as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

~~(1617)~~ **"Significant Risk Threshold"** means any of the following health risk levels:

- (i) Except as provided in Subsection (e)(1)(ii), M-maximum individual cancer risks equal to or greater than 10 in one million, or
- (ii) Cancer burden equal to or greater than 1.0, or
- (iii) Total acute noncancer health hazard index equal to or greater than 1.0, or
- (iv) Total chronic noncancer health hazard index equal to or greater than 1.0.

~~(141718)~~ **"Small Business"** means the same as defined in California Government Code Section 11342(e)-11342.610.

~~(151819)~~ **"Stationary Source"** means the same as defined in Rule 2 – Definitions- ~~of these Rules and Regulations.~~

(20) “Technically Feasible” means a control technology or technique that has been achieved in practice, as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

~~(161921)~~ **"Total Acute Noncancer Health Hazard Index"** means the estimated ~~potential~~ risk of acute ~~public~~-health effects and is the sum of the individual substance acute health hazard indexes affecting the same target organ system for a maximally exposed individual for all toxic air contaminants emitted from a stationary source and identified in Table III.

~~(172022)~~ **"Total Chronic Noncancer Health Hazard Index"** means the estimated ~~potential~~ risk of chronic ~~public~~-health effects and is the sum of the individual substance chronic health hazard indexes affecting the same target organ system for a ~~potential~~ maximally exposed individual for all toxic air contaminants emitted from a stationary source and identified in Table II.

~~(182123)~~ **"Toxic Air Contaminant"** means the air contaminants listed in Table I (carcinogenic), Table II (noncarcinogenic-chronic) or Table III (noncarcinogenic-acute), which have a health standard approved by the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), ~~and are listed in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, October, 1993, or listed in any health risk assessment guidelines adopted by OEHHA pursuant to Division 26, Part 6, Chapter 6 of the California Health and Safety Code (SB 1731 procedures) that replace all or part of such CAPCOA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, October, 1993.~~

The Air Pollution Control Officer may revise Tables I, II or III upon OEHHA adoption of any new or revised health standard and 30 days after public notice of the proposed changes is published in a newspaper of general circulation. A member of the public may petition the Air Pollution Control Officer to add toxic air contaminants to these tables.

~~The Air Pollution Control Officer may revise Tables I, II or III upon OEHHA adoption of revised CAPCOA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines or upon OEHHA adoption of any health risk assessment guidelines or revisions pursuant to Division 26, Part 6, Chapter 6 of the California Health and Safety Code (SB 1731 procedures) that replace all or part of such CAPCOA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, October, 1993, or with the concurrence of OEHHA and 30 days after public notice of the proposed changes is published in a newspaper of general circulation. A member of the public may petition the Air Pollution Control Officer to add air contaminants to these tables.~~

#### **(d) PUBLIC HEALTH RISK NOTIFICATION AND PUBLIC MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

(1) ~~Except as provided in Subsections (d)(2) and (d)(3),~~ The owner or operator of each stationary source for which a public health risk assessment has been approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer and which risk assessment indicates potential

public health risks at or above the significant risk threshold(s), levels specified in Subsections (d)(1)(i), (ii), (iii) or (iv) shall provide written public notice of such risks and conduct a public meeting in accordance with the provisions of Subsections (d)(2) through (d)(11).

Public notice shall be by direct mailing, to each resident, business, parent or guardian of each student, and administrators of each school, hospital, day care center, convalescent home and any other sensitive receptor within the isopleth exposed to health risks at or above the significant risk threshold(s) ~~potentially exposed to such risks as specified by the Air Pollution Control Officer.~~

~~Unless the health risk assessment for a stationary source is based on the estimated toxic air contaminant emissions at the source during calendar year 1989, the Air Pollution Control Officer will notify the owner or operator within 15 days after District approval of a health risk assessment whether public notice of such risks is required. If the approved public health risk assessment indicates potential public health risks at or above the levels specified in Subsections (e)(1) or (e)(2), as applicable, the Air Pollution Control Officer will indicate in the notification to the owner or operator that the owner or operator must also comply with Section (e) of this rule.~~

- ~~(i) Maximum incremental cancer risks equal to or greater than 10 in one million, or~~
- ~~(ii) Cancer burden equal to or greater than 1.0, or~~
- ~~(iii) Total acute noncancer health hazard index equal to or greater than 1.0, or~~
- ~~(iv) Total chronic noncancer health hazard index equal to or greater than 1.0.~~

~~Upon receipt of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer that the approved public health risk assessment indicates potential public health risks equal to or greater than the above levels, the owner or operator shall provide written public notice in accordance with the provisions of Subsections (d)(5) through (d)(15) of this rule.~~

~~(2) Written public notice shall not be required for a total acute or chronic noncancer health hazard index equal to or greater than 1.0 but less than 5.0 if the Air Pollution Control Officer determines, after consultation with the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, that adverse public health effects are unlikely to occur at the levels of exposure estimated in the approved public health risk assessment.~~

~~(3) If the approved public health risk assessment for a stationary source is based on estimated toxic air contaminant emissions at the source during calendar year 1989, the written public notice required by Subsection (d)(1) shall be based on the 1989 emissions based approved risk assessment unless the owner or operator of the stationary~~



source has:

- (i) Submitted an updated emission inventory report which has been approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer by June 12, 1996, and
- (ii) Demonstrated, by July 29, 1996, to the satisfaction of the Air Pollution Control Officer that potential public health risks are likely to have dropped:
  - (A) From equal to or greater than to below any of the public notification levels specified in Subsection (d)(1) or (d)(2), or
  - (B) From equal to or greater than to below any of the significant risk mitigation levels specified in Subsection (e)(1) or (e)(2), or
  - (C) By at least 80% from any of the overall facility cancer or non-cancer risk levels in the approved health risk assessment based on toxic air contaminant emissions during calendar year 1989, and
- (iii) Demonstrated, by July 29, 1996, to the satisfaction of the Air Pollution Control Officer that the decreases in indicated public health risks are the result of: permanent, quantifiable and enforceable changes in estimated emissions; changes in emission factors or methods of estimating emissions or toxic air contaminant exposure levels approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer; or changes in toxicity, cancer potency, acceptable public exposure levels, or methods for estimating public exposures recommended by the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, and
- (iv) Prepared and submitted an updated public health risk assessment in accordance with the following schedule:
  - (A) Within 45 days after receipt of a final determination from the Air Pollution Control Officer that the stationary source is eligible to base the public notification required by Subsection (d)(1) on an updated public health risk assessment, submit for approval by the Air Pollution Control Officer a protocol describing the manner by which the updated public health risk assessment will be conducted.
  - (B) Within 90 days of approval of the protocol, submit an updated public health risk assessment to the Air Pollution Control Officer for approval. The updated health risk assessment shall be prepared following the approved protocol.
  - (C) Within 30 days of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer identifying any deficiencies in the updated public health risk assessment, revise and resubmit for approval a corrected risk assessment that addresses those deficiencies.

~~If an updated public health risk assessment has been prepared and approved pursuant to this Subsection (d)(3), the written public notice required by Subsection (d)(1) shall be given based upon the results of the updated health risk assessment and in accordance with the provisions of Subsections (d)(5) through (d)(15) of this rule. Public notice shall be given upon receipt of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer that the updated risk assessment has been approved and that the results indicate potential public health risks above the levels specified in Subsection (d)(1)(i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) or (d)(2) or (e)(1) or (e)(2), if applicable. In the event an updated health risk assessment is disapproved, or the owner or operator fails to comply with the schedule for updating a risk assessment specified in this Subsection (d)(3), the Air Pollution Control Officer shall require the owner or operator to provide public notice and, if applicable, comply with the provisions of Section (e) based on the most recent approved public health risk assessment for the stationary source.~~

~~(4) In implementing the provisions of Subsection (d)(3), the Air Pollution Control Officer shall:~~

~~(i) By June 27, 1996, make a preliminary determination of each affected stationary source's eligibility to update its public health risk assessment and provide written notice of the preliminary determination to each affected stationary source. The preliminary determination shall be based on the most recent approved emission inventory report for the stationary source, updated stationary source prioritization scores, stationary source permit information, and stationary source-supplied information, and~~

~~(ii) Provide the public and the owner or operator of each affected stationary source 30 days to submit written comments on the preliminary determination and to submit any relevant additional information, and~~

~~Provide notice of the preliminary determinations in a newspaper of general circulation. Such notice shall contain the name and location of each affected stationary source, and the preliminary determination made for each source. The notice shall state that the materials on which the Air Pollution Control Officer based the determinations are available for review at the District, and that the District in making a final determination of each source's eligibility to update its risk assessment will consider all written comments and any relevant additional information submitted within the 30-day comment period described above. The notice shall also state that written public notice may be required to be given to fewer persons under a revised risk assessment than under the 1989 emissions-based public health risk assessment, and that the 1989 emissions-based public health risk assessments are available for review at the District. The notice shall also state the schedule for the District to receive any updated risk assessments, and that the updated risk assessments will be available for review at the District, and~~

~~(iii) By August 26, 1996, make a final determination of each affected stationary source's eligibility to update its public health risk assessment and provide written notice of the final determination to each affected stationary source, and~~

~~(iv) Within 30 days of receipt of a risk assessment protocol submitted pursuant to Subsection (d)(3)(iv)(A), approve or revise and approve the protocol and provide written notice of the approval to the owner or operator of the affected stationary source, and~~

~~(v) Provide notice of receipt of an updated risk assessment to any person who requests such notice, and within 60 days of receipt of an updated public health risk assessment submitted pursuant to Subsections (d)(3)(iv)(B) or (d)(3)(iv)(C), approve, revise and approve, or disapprove the risk assessment and provide written notice of the approval or disapproval to the owner or operator and notice of whether the results of the most recently approved public health risk assessment indicate potential public health risks above the levels specified in Subsection (d)(1).~~

(52) Within ~~45~~ 45 days of the date of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer that public notification is required pursuant to ~~Subsections (d)(1) or (d)(3) of this rule,~~ the owner or operator of a stationary source shall prepare and submit to the Air Pollution Control Officer, for approval, a public notification plan. The plan shall include all of the following:

(i) A proposed public notification letter to be signed by the Air Pollution Control Officer. The proposed notification letter shall be identical in form and text to the model notification letter provided by the Air Pollution Control Officer and shall include the additional stationary source-specific information required by the model notification letter. When applicable, the proposed public notification letter shall also include information about the required public meeting, such as date and location of the meeting and/or how the public can participate in the meeting if the meeting is virtual. ~~If notification is based on an updated risk assessment pursuant to Subsection (d)(3), the letter shall state that the 1989 emissions-based risk assessment is available at the District for review by interested members of the public.~~

(ii) Any proposed optional stationary source informational letter to accompany the public notification letter which shall comply with the requirements of Subsection (d)(3)(~~iii~~iv).

(iii) Clear and readable maps with isopleths.

~~(iii-iv)~~ (iv) The name, e-mail address, and phone number of the person(s) responsible for coordinating public notification and the public meeting for the stationary source.

~~(iv-v)~~ (v) A description of the proposed methodology, such as the use of a mailing service, for obtaining the addresses of residents and persons to be notified and for carrying out the notification process.

~~(v-vi)~~ (vi) A list of all zip codes or census tracts addresses to be included in the notification area, ~~and the estimated total number of notification letters to be mailed.~~

~~(vi-vii)~~ (vii) A list of all schools, hospitals, day care centers, convalescent homes and other sensitive receptors to be notified and a proposal on how the owner or operator will notify businesses and/or sensitive receptors pursuant to Subsections (d)(3)(v) and (vi).

~~(vii-viii)~~ (viii) A list of the primary languages spoken by non-English speaking persons in the area to receive notification where such language is the primary language of ~~five percent~~ 5% or more of the total persons to be notified in any census tract in the area to receive notification.

~~(viii-ix)~~ (ix) A proposed method, including a timeline and due date, for responding to public comments and requests.

The Air Pollution Control Officer shall approve, or revise and approve, the public notification plan within ~~30-45~~ 30 days of receipt of the plan.

(63) Within ~~45-30~~ days of the date of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer of the approval of the public notification plan, ~~the~~ owner or operator of a stationary source ~~required to provide written public notice pursuant to this rule~~ shall implement the approved stationary source public notification plan, ~~as approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer, within 30 days of the date of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer of such approval.~~ Each written public notice ~~shall be mailed via the U.S. Postal Service and~~ shall contain only:

(i) The approved public notification letter signed by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

(ii) An “Air Toxics Hot Spots Fact Sheet” and a “Public Response Survey

Card” reproduced from originals provided by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

(iii) A copy of the maps, with the isopleths, that was submitted with the notification plan pursuant to Subsection (d)(2)(iii).

~~(iii-iv)~~ Any optional stationary source informational letter that has been approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer and shall enhance and not undermine the health risk notification process. The content of the optional stationary source informational letter shall be limited to the following:

(A) A discussion of toxic air contaminants emitted, emission rates, and the reasons why the emissions occur.

(B) A discussion of steps taken by the stationary source to reduce emissions or health risks to the public.

(C) A brief and factual discussion of the health risk assessment results and the health protective assumptions of the health risk assessment.

(D) The name, e-mail address, and phone number of the stationary source contact(s) regarding the public notification, the public meeting, and the health risk assessment.

~~(iv-v)~~ For each public notification directed to a business, that the business post or circulate the District public notification letter for review by all on-site employees of the business.

~~(v-vi)~~ For each public notification directed to a school, a request that the administrator of the school, or an assignee of the administrator, distribute notices provided by the owner or operator of a stationary source to the parents or guardians of students attending the school. The cost of such distribution shall be paid by the owner or operator of a stationary source.

~~(vi-vii)~~ At the option of the owner or operator of the stationary source, a notice to carry out the warning requirements of Section 25249.6 of the California Health and Safety Code provided such notice has been determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer not to conflict with the intent or content of the public notifications required by this rule.

~~(74)~~ Multilingual notifications shall be provided by the owner or operator of a stationary source ~~required to provide public notification pursuant to this rule if five percent~~ if 5% or more of the recipients within any census tract in the area to receive

notification are non-English speaking. In such case, the notifications shall be provided in those languages which are the primary language of ~~five percent~~ 5% or more of the total persons to be notified in that census tract.

~~(8) Any stationary source informational letter to be included in the notification required by this rule shall be approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer and shall enhance and not undermine the public health risk notification process. The stationary source informational letter may include:~~

~~(i) A discussion of air contaminants emitted, emission rates, and the reasons why the emissions occur.~~

~~(ii) A discussion of steps taken, or future steps planned, by the stationary source to reduce emissions or risks to the public. The owner or operator shall document to the Air Pollution Control Officer any such steps taken and/or provide a written commitment to the Air Pollution Control Officer for any steps planned.~~

~~(iii) A brief and factual discussion of the risk assessment results and the uncertainties and conservatism of the risk assessment.~~

~~(iv) The name, address and phone number of a stationary source contact regarding the public notification and the risk assessment.~~

(5) Distribution of the public notice must be conducted by the U.S. Postal Service or other postage provider. The cost of distribution of the public notice shall be paid by the owner or operator of the stationary source.

~~(96) Each public notification shall be mailed in an envelope supplied by the Air Pollution Control Officer and addressed to “eCurrent #Resident” of private residences, businesses, or sensitive receptors. The envelope shall be marked with the name and address of the Air Pollution Control District and the words “Public Health Information” if mailed to areas where the approved health risk assessment indicates potential risks below the significant risk mitigation levels specified in Section (c) of this rule. The envelope shall be marked with the words “Public Health Notice” if mailed to areas where the approved health risk assessment indicates potential risks at or above the significant risk mitigation levels.~~

~~(407) If the owner or operator of a stationary source fails to carry out the public notification requirements of this rule, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall carry out such notification at the earliest possible date. All District costs of such notification shall be paid by the owner or operator of the stationary source.~~

~~(11) The parents or legal guardians of students attending schools with potential exposure to risks above the notification levels specified in Subsection (d)(1) shall be notified by one of the following methods as determined by the administrator of the affected school:~~

~~(i) The owner or operator of the stationary source shall provide written notice by direct mailing based on a mailing list of parents or guardians provided by the school, or~~

~~(ii) The administrator of the school, or an assignee of the administrator, shall distribute notices provided by the stationary source owner or operator to the parents or guardians. The cost of such distribution shall be paid by the owner or operator of the stationary source, or~~

~~(iii) An alternative method acceptable to the administrator of the school and the owner or operator of the stationary source provided the Air Pollution Control Officer finds that such method meets the intent of the notification requirements of this rule.~~

~~(12) The owner or operator of the stationary source shall prepare and distribute a public health risk assessment summary to those persons receiving notice pursuant to this rule requesting additional information within 30 days of such requests. Such requests shall be in writing or by appropriately marking and returning the "Public Response Survey Card" specified in Subsection (d)(6). The summary shall be approved in advance by the Air Pollution Control Officer and shall provide information on the health risk assessment in more detail than the initial public notification. The summary shall include information concerning stationary source operations, emissions, potential cancer and noncancer public health impacts, and past, current and future stationary source risk reduction efforts.~~

~~(13) If, based on the public response from persons receiving notice pursuant to this rule within 30 days of public notification, the Air Pollution Control Officer determines, on a case-by-case basis, that a public meeting is required, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall so notify the owner or operator of the affected stationary source and the owner or operator shall hold a public meeting within 90 days after public notification. The meeting shall be held at a time and place that facilitates public attendance. Translators shall be present if five percent or more of the expected audience is non-English speaking. The Air Pollution Control Officer, or designee, shall attend each public meeting.~~

~~The owner or operator of a stationary source required to conduct a public meeting shall plan, provide notice of and conduct such meeting, and shall bear the costs, including District costs, of holding the meeting. Notice of the meeting shall be sent to all persons expressing interest in having a meeting, shall be provided at least 14 days prior to the meeting, and shall be in English and the primary language(s) spoken by each non-English speaking ethnic group representing five percent or more of the persons receiving notice of the meeting.~~

(148) ~~The owner or operator of a stationary source required to provide public notification pursuant to Section (d) of this rule, and which stationary source's most recently approved public health risk assessment indicates potential public health risks above the significant risk mitigation levels specified in Section (e) of this rule, shall provide subsequent public notification annually-biennially, in accordance with the procedures of this rule; annually and shall include the status of the risk reduction plan, when applicable, in the notification. The owner or operator may cease annual-biennial public notification upon demonstrating, to the satisfaction of the Air Pollution Control Officer, that potential public health risks have been reduced to below the significant risk mitigation levels threshold(s) or the owner or operator is not required by the Air Pollution Control Officer to prepare a health risk assessment based on the most recent prioritization score.~~

~~The owner or operator of a stationary source required to provide public notification pursuant to Section (d) of this rule, and which stationary source's most recently approved public health risk assessment indicates potential public health risks above the public notification levels specified in Subsection (d)(1) of this rule, shall provide public notification, in accordance with the procedures of this rule, biennially. The owner or operator may cease biennial public notification upon demonstrating, to the satisfaction of the Air Pollution Control Officer, that potential public health risks have been reduced below the public notification levels.~~

(159) ~~A copy of all information provided by the owner or operator of a stationary source to the public pursuant to the notification requirements of this rule shall also be provided to the Air Pollution Control Officer. Within 15 days of the date of distribution of public notification materials, the owner or operator of a stationary source shall submit to the Air Pollution Control Officer proof of distribution which shall include:~~

- ~~(i) the addresses included in the mailing and receipts from the U.S. Postal Service or other postage provider, and which describe the boundaries of notification, and addresses included in the mailing, and~~
- ~~(ii) a copy of all information provided by the owner or operator to the public pursuant to the notification requirements of this rule, and~~
- ~~(iii) a description of how the owner or operator notified businesses and/or sensitive receptors pursuant to Subsections (d)(3)(v) and (vi).~~



(10) Within 30 days of the initial public notification, or the biennial public notification if applicable as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer, the owner or operator of a stationary source shall conduct a public meeting, in coordination with the ~~District~~ Air Pollution Control Officer, and shall:

(i) Reserve a venue for the public meeting at a time that facilitates public attendance. The venue shall be located within, or if not feasible, nearby the notification area. A virtual public meeting may be conducted with approval from the Air Pollution Control Officer.

(ii) Make all necessary arrangements for the meeting including, but not limited to, providing for audio visual equipment and personnel. Interpreters shall be present if a multilingual public notification is required pursuant to Subsection (d)(4).

(iii) Attend the meeting to answer any questions related to the stationary source operations.

(iv) Bear the costs, including District costs, of holding the meeting.

(11) The Air Pollution Control Officer, or designee, shall establish the agenda of the meeting, in collaboration with the owner or operator of the stationary source, and attend each public meeting to provide information regarding the Air Toxics Hot Spots Program and the results of the health risk assessment.

**(e) ~~STATIONARY SOURCE TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT RISK~~  
REDUCTION AUDITS AND PLANS**

(1) ~~Except as provided in Subsections (e)(2), and (e)(3), and (e)(4), w~~ Within six months ~~120-180~~ days of receipt of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer that a stationary source's most recent approved public health risk assessment indicates potential public health risks equal to or greater than one or more of the following significant risk mitigation levels at or above the significant risk threshold(s), the owner or operator shall submit to the Air Pollution Control Officer, for completeness review ~~for completeness and approval~~, a stationary source toxic air contaminant risk reduction audit and plan. For the purpose of this section, the significant risk threshold for maximum individual cancer risk shall be:

(i) equal to or greater than 10 in one million for emissions inventory years 2018 and later, or

(ii) equal to or greater than 100 in one million for emissions inventory years prior to 2018.

~~(i) Maximum incremental cancer risks equal to or greater than 100 in one million, or~~

~~(ii) Cancer burden equal to or greater than 1.0, or~~

~~(iii) Total acute noncancer health hazard index equal to or greater than 1.0, or~~

~~(iv) Total chronic noncancer health hazard index equal to or greater than 1.0.~~

The risk reduction audit and plan shall comply with the requirements of Subsection (e)(4-2) and shall ~~contains airborne toxic risk reduction measures proposed by the owner or operator which will be sufficient to reduce the stationary source emissions to levels that result in the potential public health risks to below the significant risk threshold(s)~~ mitigation levels specified above. Such emission ~~risk~~ reductions shall be accomplished within five years of the date the plan is ~~submitted to~~ approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer, unless an extension has been granted pursuant to Subsections (e)(4) or (e)(5).

~~(2) A risk reduction audit and plan shall not be required for a total hazard index for acute or chronic health risks equal to or greater than 1.0 but less than 5.0 if the Air Pollution Control Officer determines, after consultation with the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, that adverse public health effects are unlikely to occur at the levels of exposure estimated in the approved public health risk assessment.~~

~~(32) The Air Pollution Control Officer may shorten the period for an owner or operator of a stationary source to reduce risks to below the significant risk threshold(s) mitigation levels if the Air Pollution Control Officer finds that it is technically feasible and economically practicable for the stationary source to do so or if the Air Pollution Control Officer finds that the emissions from the stationary source pose an unreasonable health risk. In determining whether the period for risk reduction shall be shortened, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall consider:~~

~~(i) Whether it is technically feasible to reduce the estimated maximum incremental individual cancer risks for exposed persons to below the significant risk threshold(s) less than 250 in one million and total chronic and acute noncancer health~~

~~hazard indexes to less than 10.0 in less than five years.~~

~~(ii) Whether, and to what extent, the annualized cost of the airborne toxic risk reduction measures necessary to meet the significant risk mitigation levels of Subsection (e)(1) is not more than 10 percent of the preceding five year average annual return on equity for the owner or operator, whichever has the higher average annual return on equity. Whether the proposed airborne toxic risk reduction measures which could be implemented in less than 5 years are economically practicable.~~

~~(iii) Whether the airborne toxic risk reduction measures which could be implemented in less than five years are based on technologies that have been proven in field applications, as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer.~~

~~(iv) Whether there are alternative airborne toxic risk reduction measures available that are technically feasible and economically practicable, and which can be implemented by the owner or operator sooner than the measures proposed by the owner or operator. If such alternative measures are available, the Air Pollution Control Officer may require that such measures be implemented prior to or in replacement of one or more of the measures proposed by the owner or operator.~~

~~(v) Whether there are additional stationary sources required to reduce public health risks pursuant to this Section (e) Risk Reduction Audits and Plans and for which there are approved health risk assessments indicating public health risks at or above the significant risk threshold(s) mitigation levels specified in Subsections (e)(1)(i), (ii), (iii) or (iv) for some or all of the same persons at risk by emissions from the stationary source under review.~~

(4) The Air Pollution Control Officer may lengthen the period for a stationary source owner or operator to reduce risks below the significant risk mitigation levels by up to an additional five years. To do so, the Air Pollution Control Officer must find that a period longer than five years will not result in an unreasonable risk to public health and that requiring implementation of the risk reduction audit and plan within five years would impose an unreasonable economic burden on the owner or operator, or is not technically feasible. In determining whether an owner or operator should be allowed more than five years to reduce risks below the significant risk mitigation levels, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall:

(i) ~~Not allow more than five years to reduce the estimated maximum incremental cancer risks for exposed persons to less than 250 in one million and total chronic and acute noncancer health hazard indexes to less than 10.0.~~

(ii) ~~Not require airborne toxic risk reduction measures to be implemented within five years, except as necessary to meet the requirements of Subsection (e)(4)(i), to the extent that the annualized cost of such measures exceeds 10 percent of the preceding five year average annual return on equity for the owner or operator, whichever has the higher average annual return on equity.~~

(iii) ~~Not require airborne toxic risk reduction measures to be implemented within five years, except as necessary to meet the requirements of Subsection~~

~~(e)(4)(i), to the extent those measures are based on technologies that have not yet been proven in field applications, as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer.~~

~~(iv) Determine if alternative airborne toxic risk reduction measures are available that are technically feasible and economically practicable and which can be implemented by the owner or operator sooner than the measures proposed by the owner or operator. If such alternative measures are available, the Air Pollution Control Officer may require that such measures be implemented prior to or in replacement of one or more of the measures proposed by the owner or operator.~~

~~(v) Determine that the owner or operator will implement those airborne toxic risk reduction measures that are technically feasible and economically practicable as expeditiously as possible.~~

~~(vi) Consider whether there are additional stationary sources required to reduce public health risks pursuant to this Section (e) and for which there are approved health risk assessments indicating public health risks above the significant risk mitigation levels specified in Subsections (e)(1)(i), (ii), (iii) or (iv) for some or all of the same persons at risk by emissions from the stationary source under review.~~

~~The Air Pollution Control Officer shall not allow longer than five years if not specifically requested by the owner or operator. In making such a request, the owner or operator shall provide, in the manner and form prescribed by the Air Pollution Control Officer, all relevant information needed by the Air Pollution Control Officer to make the determinations specified above. The Air Pollution Control Officer may impose conditions on the approval of a period longer than five years as necessary to ensure that airborne toxic risk reduction measures that are technically feasible and economically practicable are implemented as expeditiously as possible.~~

(2) The risk reduction audit and plan submitted by the owner or operator shall be accompanied by appropriate application(s) to implement the plan and contain all of the following:

(i) The name and location of the stationary source.

(ii) A facility risk characterization which includes an updated emissions inventory report and health risk assessment, if the risk due to total facility emissions has increased to above or decreased to below the levels indicated in the previously approved health risk assessment.

(iii) The identification of all the emission unit(s) for which the owner or operator proposes to reduce toxic air contaminant emissions and the identification

of the airborne toxic risk reduction measures proposed for implementation to reduce such emissions, and the anticipated emission and health risk reductions.

(iv) A schedule for implementing the proposed airborne toxic risk reduction measures within five years. The schedule shall include specific increments of progress towards implementing the airborne toxic risk reduction measures.

(v) A demonstration, including supporting documentation such as emission calculations, that the proposed airborne toxic risk reduction measures will reduce or eliminate toxic air contaminant emissions from the stationary source. The demonstration shall be made through analogy with the approved health risk assessment for the stationary source or by submission of a revised forecast risk assessment. The demonstration also shall include any foreseeable new or increased emissions of toxic air contaminants from the stationary source and the estimated health risks resulting from such new or increased emissions during the period approved for implementation of the risk reduction audit and plan.

(vi) A schedule for providing progress reports on reductions in emissions of toxic air contaminants and estimated health risks achieved under the implemented plan. Progress reports shall be provided not less frequently than within 12 months from when the plan is approved, and annually thereafter, and may be incorporated into emission inventory report updates required pursuant to Section 44344 of the California Health and Safety Code.

(3) Within 30 days of receipt of a risk reduction audit and plan submitted pursuant to Subsection (e)(2), the Air Pollution Control Officer shall provide public notice of such plan receipt and make the risk reduction audit and plan available for public review and provide for a 30-day comment period.

(4) The Air Pollution Control Officer may, upon a request pursuant to Subsection (e)(6), allow a 3-year extension for an owner or operator of a stationary source to reduce risks to below the significant risk threshold(s) provided the owner or

operator has installed T-BARCT on all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s).

(5) The Air Pollution Control Officer may, upon a request pursuant to Subsection (e)(6), allow subsequent 3-year extensions for an owner or operator of a stationary source to reduce risks to below the significant risk threshold(s) provided the owner or operator has implemented all technically feasible measures on all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s).

~~(36) The Air Pollution Control Officer may allow additional time for an owner or operator of a stationary source to reduce risks to below the significant risk threshold(s). However, no extension of time may be granted unless the owner or operator has reduced the health risk from all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s), to an extent that is technically feasible and economically practicable. The owner or operator of a stationary source requesting an extension to reduce risks to below the significant risk threshold(s) shall submit the extension request to the Air Pollution Control Officer, in the manner and form prescribed by the Air Pollution Control Officer. The extension request which shall include all of the following:~~

~~(i) Demonstration that T-BARCT and/or all technically feasible control measures, as applicable, have been installed or implemented on the health risks from all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s) have been reduced to an extent that is technically feasible and economically practicable.~~

~~(ii) Supporting documentation to demonstrate that reducing risks to below the significant risk threshold(s) is not technically feasible or economically practicable for the stationary source.~~

~~(iii) A proposal demonstrating that T-BARCT has been installed on all emission units at the stationary source, where it is economically practicable.~~

(ii) Quantification of the risk reduction that has been achieved by the implementation of T-BARCT and/or all technically feasible control measures, as

applicable, from all emission units within the stationary source contributing to the exceedance of the significant risk threshold(s).

(iii) An implementation schedule which shall include dates for installation and/or implementation of all technically feasible control measures, as applicable.

The Air Pollution Control Officer may impose conditions on the approval of additional time, as necessary, to ensure that airborne toxic risk reduction measures that are technically feasible and economically practicable are implemented as expeditiously as possible.

~~This extension can only be granted by the Air Pollution Control Officer for up to 3 additional years. Additional extensions might be granted provided the requirements in this Subsection (c)(3) are met, as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer.~~

(7) Within 30 days of receipt of an extension request pursuant to Subsection (e)(6), the Air Pollution Control Officer shall provide public notice of such extension request and make the extension request available for public review and provide for a 30-day comment period.

(8) At least 30 days prior to the approval of any extension request, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall conduct a public meeting to discuss the proposed extension and obtain input from the public.

~~(54) The risk reduction audit and plan submitted by the owner or operator shall contain all of the following:~~

~~(i) The name, and location and standard industrial classification (SIC) code of the stationary source.~~

~~(ii) The identification of the emission units and toxic air contaminants emitted by each emission unit that contribute to potential public health risks above the significant risk mitigation levels specified in Subsection (c)(1). Emission units shall be listed by decreasing contribution to the total potential public health risks estimated for the stationary source. Toxic air contaminants shall be listed for each emission unit by decreasing contribution to the potential public health risk estimated for that unit. A facility risk characterization which includes an updated emission inventory report and health risk assessment, if the risk due to total facility emissions has increased to above or decreased to below the levels indicated in the previously approved health risk assessment.~~

~~The plan need not include identification of emission units which emit toxic air contaminants in amounts which the approved public health risk assessment indicates do not cause maximum incremental cancer risks greater than 1.0 in a million, nor a total acute noncancer health hazard index of 1.0 or greater, nor a total chronic noncancer health hazard index of 1.0 or greater. The plan shall include identification of all emission units for which the owner or operator proposes to reduce toxic air contaminant emissions as part of the risk reduction audit and plan.~~

~~(iii) A listing and an evaluation of all airborne toxic risk reduction measures available to the owner or operator and which could be used to reduce emissions from the emission units identified in Subsection (c)(5)(ii). The evaluation shall identify the emission units and toxic air contaminants affected by each measure and the extent of emission reductions that would be achieved for each emission unit and each affected contaminant.~~

~~(iviii) The identification of all the emission unit(s) and the rationale for which the owner or operator proposes to reduce toxic air contaminant emissions and the identification of the airborne toxic risk reduction measures proposed for implementation to reduce such emissions, by the owner or operator. The plan shall also include the rationale for not proposing for implementation any of the airborne toxic risk reduction measures identified as available to the owner or operator, including those identified as infeasible or not economically reasonable.~~

~~(iv) A schedule for implementing the proposed airborne toxic risk reduction measures within five years or within a shorter or longer period as determined by the Air Pollution Control Officer pursuant to Subsections (c)(3 ~~2~~) or (c)(4 ~~3~~) of this rule. The schedule shall include specific increments of progress towards implementing the airborne toxic risk reduction measures. The schedule shall include dates by which applications for any authorities to construct or modified permits to operate will be submitted to the Air Pollution Control Officer, by which each measure will be in place, and by which the actual in-use effectiveness of each measure will be demonstrated to the Air Pollution Control Officer.~~

~~(vi) A demonstration, including supporting documentation such as emission calculations, that the proposed airborne toxic risk reduction measures will be sufficient to reduce or eliminate toxic air contaminant emissions from the stationary source to levels sufficient to ensure that potential public health risks from such emissions are below the significant risk threshold(s) mitigation levels specified in Subsection (c)(1) of this rule, or that all feasible measures will be implemented and T-BARCT will be installed as required by Subsection (c)(3). The demonstration shall be made through analogy with the approved public health risk assessment for the stationary source or by submission of a revised forecast risk assessment. The demonstration shall include any foreseeable new or increased emissions of toxic air contaminants from the stationary source and the estimated public health risks resulting from such new or increased emissions during the period approved for implementation of the risk reduction audit and~~



~~plan.~~

~~(vii) A schedule for providing progress reports on reductions in emissions of toxic air contaminants and estimated public health risks achieved under the implemented plan. Progress reports shall be provided not less frequently than annually within a calendar year from when the plan is approved, and annually thereafter, and may be incorporated into toxic air contaminant emission inventory report updates required pursuant to Section 44344 of the California Health and Safety Code.~~

~~(viii) A certification by an engineer registered as a professional engineer pursuant to Section 6762 of the Business and Professions Code, by an individual responsible for processes or operations of the affected stationary source, or by an environmental assessor registered pursuant to Section 25570.3 of the Health and Safety Code, that the audit and plan submitted meets the requirements of Section (e) of this rule and Part 6, Chapter 6 of Division 26 of the Health and Safety Code.~~

~~(6) Within 30 days of receipt of a risk reduction audit and plan submitted pursuant to this section, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall provide notice in a newspaper of general circulation, and direct notice to all individuals requesting such notice for the specific stationary source, of receipt of the plan, the availability of the plan for public inspection, and an opportunity to provide written comments regarding the plan within 30 days.~~

~~(7) Within 90 days after receipt of a risk reduction audit and plan submitted pursuant to this section, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall determine whether the plan is complete and so notify the owner or operator. A plan will be determined to be complete if it meets all of the requirements of this section. In determining whether a plan is complete, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall evaluate whether the airborne-toxic risk reduction measures proposed are sufficient to achieve the emission reductions necessary to reduce potential public health risks below the significant risk mitigation levels specified in Subsection (e)(1) within five years or such other period approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer pursuant to Subsections (e)(3) or (e)(4).~~

~~(8) If the Air Pollution Control Officer finds that a risk reduction audit and plan is incomplete, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall remand the plan to the owner or operator for revision, specifying the deficiencies in the plan. Within 90 days of the date the remanded plan is received, the owner or operator shall submit a revised risk reduction audit and plan that corrects the deficiencies identified by the Air Pollution Control Officer.~~

~~Within 90 days of receipt of a revised plan, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall determine whether the revised plan is complete and so notify the owner or operator. If the Air Pollution Control Officer finds that the revised risk reduction audit and plan does not adequately correct the deficiencies identified and is not complete, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall so notify the owner or operator in writing and may remand the plan to the owner or operator for further revision or may disapprove the plan and find the owner or operator to be in violation of this rule.~~

(9) If the Air Pollution Control Officer finds that the risk reduction audit and plan is not approvable, the Air Pollution Control Officer shall notify the owner or operator in writing and may remand the plan to the owner or operator for further revision. An approvable plan shall be submitted by the owner or operator within 60 days of such notification. If an approvable plan is not submitted, the Air Pollution Control Officer may disapprove the plan and find the owner or operator to be in violation of this rule.

~~(9) The owner or operator of a stationary source subject to the requirements of this section (e) shall commence implementation of the risk reduction audit and plan for the stationary source upon receipt of written notice from the Air Pollution Control Officer that the plan has been determined to be complete. The owner or operator shall fully implement the plan as determined complete by the Air Pollution Control Officer and in accordance with the schedule specified in the complete plan.~~

~~(10) Upon full implementation of each airborne toxic risk reduction measure identified in a risk reduction audit and plan determined to be complete by the Air Pollution Control Officer, the measure shall become enforceable by the Air Pollution Control Officer through inclusion of appropriate and necessary conditions on current permits to operate for the affected emission units. This Subsection (e)(10) shall not preclude an owner or operator from requesting, nor the Air Pollution Control Officer from granting, modifications to a permit to operate for an affected emission unit if the owner or operator demonstrates that the modifications will not interfere with the attainment of the risk reductions, and dates, contained in the complete risk reduction audit and plan.~~

~~(11)~~(10) The Air Pollution Control Officer may require that a risk reduction audit and plan be revised and resubmitted if the Air Pollution Control Officer receives new information regarding toxic air contaminant emissions from the stationary source or alternative airborne toxic risk reduction measures that would significantly impact or reduce risks to exposed persons. A revised plan shall be submitted by the owner or operator within 60 days of such notification.

(f) **PROGRAM FEES**

All costs incurred by the Air Pollution Control Officer ~~in carrying out~~ associated with the public notification, public meeting, and risk reduction audit and plan requirements of this rule in conjunction with an affected stationary source shall be paid by the owner or operator of that stationary source in accordance with ~~Section (m) Subsection (f)(6) Toxic Hot Spots, of Rule 40 – Permit and Other Fees.~~ Section (f)(6) Toxic Hot Spots, of Rule 40 – Permit and Other Fees.

**Table I****Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Carcinogenic Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Acetaldehyde	75-07-0	6/12/1996
Acetamide	60-35-5	1/11/2001
Acrylamide	79-06-1	6/12/1996
Acrylonitrile	107-13-1	6/12/1996
Allyl chloride	107-05-1	1/11/2001
2-Aminoanthraquinone	117-79-3	1/11/2001
Aniline	62-53-3	1/11/2001
Arsenic (inorganic) and compounds	7440-38-2	6/12/1996
Asbestos	1332-21-4	6/12/1996
Benzene	71-43-2	6/12/1996
Benzidine (and its salts) as follows:	92-87-5	6/12/1996
Benzidine based dyes	1020	6/12/1996
Direct Black 38	1937-37-7	6/12/1996
Direct Blue 6	2602-46-2	6/12/1996
Direct Brown 95 (technical grade)	16071-86-6	6/12/1996
Benzyl chloride	100-44-7	1/11/2001
Beryllium and compounds	7440-41-7	6/12/1996
Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether (Dichloroethyl ether)	111-44-4	1/11/2001
Bis (chloromethyl) ether	542-88-1	1/11/2001
Potassium Bromate	7758-01-2	1/11/2001
1,3-Butadiene	106-99-0	6/12/1996
Cadmium and compounds	7440-43-9	6/12/1996
Carbon tetrachloride (tetrachloromethane)	56-23-5	6/12/1996
Chlorinated Paraffins	108171-26-2	1/11/2001
4-Chloro-o-phenylenediamine	95-83-0	1/11/2001
Chloroform	67-66-3	6/12/1996
Chlorophenols as follows:	N/A	6/12/1996
Pentachlorophenol	87-86-5	6/12/1996
2, 4, 6 - trichlorophenol	88-06-2	6/12/1996
P-chloro-o-toluidine	95-69-2	1/11/2001
Chromium (hexavalent) and compounds including, but not limited to:	18540-29-9	6/12/1996
Barium chromate	10294-40-3	6/12/1996
Calcium chromate	13765-19-0	6/12/1996
Lead chromate	7758-97-6	6/12/1996
Sodium dichromate	10588-01-9	6/12/1996
Strontium chromate	7789-06-2	6/12/1996
Chromium trioxide (as chromic acid mist)	1333-82-0	6/12/1996
Cobalt	7440-48-4	2/26/2021
P-cresidine	120-71-8	1/11/2001
Cupferron	135-20-6	1/11/2001
2,4-diaminoanisole	615-05-4	1/11/2001
2,4-diaminotoluene	95-80-7	1/11/2001
1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	96-12-8	6/12/1996
P-dichlorobenzene	106-46-7	6/12/1996

**Table I – continued**

**Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Carcinogenic Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
3,3-dichlorobenzidine	91-94-1	6/12/1996
1,1-dichloroethane (ethylidene dichloride)	75-34-3	1/11/2001
Di (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP)	117-81-7	6/12/1996
P-dimethylaminoazobenzene	60-11-7	1/11/2001
2,4-dinitrotoluene	121-14-2	1/11/2001
1,4-dioxane (1,4-diethylene dioxide)	123-91-1	6/12/1996
Epichlorohydrin (1-chloro-2,3-epoxypropane)	106-89-8	6/12/1996
Ethyl benzene	100-41-4	11/14/2007
Ethylene dibromide (1, 2 - dibromoethane)	106-93-4	6/12/1996
Ethylene dichloride (1, 2 – dichloroethane)	107-06-2	6/12/1996
Ethylene oxide (1,2-epoxyethane)	75-21-8	6/12/1996
Ethylene thiourea	96-45-7	1/11/2001
Formaldehyde	50-00-0	6/12/1996
Hexachlorobenzene	118-74-1	6/12/1996
Hexachlorocyclohexanes (mixed or technical grade)	608-73-1	6/12/1996
Alpha - hexachlorocyclohexane	319-84-6	6/12/1996
Beta - hexachlorocyclohexane	319-85-7	6/12/1996
Gamma - hexachlorocyclohexane (Lindane)	58-89-9	6/12/1996
Hydrazine	302-01-2	6/12/1996
Lead (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7439-92-1	1/11/2001
Lead acetate	301-04-2	1/11/2001
Lead phosphate	7446-27-7	1/11/2001
Lead subacetate	1335-32-6	1/11/2001
Methyl tertiary-butyl ether	1634-04-4	1/11/2001
4,4'-methylene bis (2-chloroaniline) (MOCA)	101-14-4	1/11/2001
Methylene chloride (dichloromethane)	75-09-2	6/12/1996
4,4'-Methylene dianiline (and its dichloride)	101-77-9	1/11/2001
Michler's Ketone (4,4'-Bis (dimethylamino) benzophenone)	90-94-8	1/11/2001
N-nitrosodi-n-butylamine	924-16-3	6/12/1996
N-nitrosodi-n-propylamine	621-64-7	6/12/1996
N-nitrosodiethylamine	55-18-5	6/12/1996
N-nitrosodimethylamine	62-75-9	6/12/1996
N-nitrosodiphenylamine	86-30-6	1/11/2001
N-nitroso-n-methylethylamine	10595-95-6	6/12/1996
N-nitrosomorpholine	59-89-2	6/12/1996
N-nitrosopiperidine	100-75-4	6/12/1996
N-nitrosopyrrolidine	930-55-2	6/12/1996
Naphthalene	91-20-3	8/03/2004
Nickel and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-02-0	6/12/1996
Nickel acetate	373-02-4	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonate	3333-67-3	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonyl	13463-39-3	6/12/1996
Nickel hydroxide	12054-48-7	6/12/1996
Nickelocene	1271-28-9	6/12/1996

Table I – continued

Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Carcinogenic Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>

COMPOUND	CAS # <sup>b</sup>	Date Added
Nickel oxide	1313-99-1	6/12/1996
Nickel refinery dust from the pyrometallurgical process	1146	6/12/1996
Nickel subsulfide	12035-72-2	6/12/1996
p-Nitrosodiphenylamine	156-10-5	6/12/1996
Particulate emissions from diesel-fueled engines	9901	9/15/2000
Perchloroethylene (tetrachloroethylene)	127-18-4	6/12/1996
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) unspciated mixtures	1336-36-3	6/12/1996
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) speciated as follows:	N/A	
3,3',4,4'-tetrachlorobiphenyl	32598-13-3	8/29/2003
3,4,4',5-tetrachlorobiphenyl	70362-50-4	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4'-pentachlorobiphenyl	32598-14-4	8/29/2003
2,3,4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	74472-37-0	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	31508-00-6	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5'-pentachlorobiphenyl	65510-44-3	8/29/2003
3,3',4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	57465-28-8	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5-hexachlorobiphenyl	38380-08-4	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	69782-90-7	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5,5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	52663-72-6	8/29/2003
3,3',4,4',5,5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	32774-16-6	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5,5'-heptachlorobiphenyl	39635-31-9	8/29/2003
Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD) as follows:	1086	6/12/1996
2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	1746-01-6	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8-pentachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	40321-76-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8-hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	39227-28-6	6/12/1996
1,2,3,6,7,8-hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	57653-85-7	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8,9-hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	19408-74-3	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-heptachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	35822-46-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-octachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	3268-87-9	6/12/1996
Polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDF) as follows:	1080	6/12/1996
2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzofuran	5120-73-19	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8-pentachlorodibenzofuran	57117-41-6	6/12/1996
2,3,4,7,8-pentachlorodibenzofuran	57117-31-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8-hexachlorodibenzofuran	70648-26-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,6,7,8- hexachlorodibenzofuran	57117-44-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8,9- hexachlorodibenzofuran	72918-21-9	6/12/1996
2,3,4,6,7,8-hexachlorodibenzofuran	60851-34-5	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-heptachlorodibenzofuran	67562-39-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-heptachlorodibenzofuran	55673-89-7	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-octachlorodibenzofuran	39001-02-0	6/12/1996
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon (PAH) as follows:	1151	6/12/1996
Benz[a]anthracene	56-55-3	6/12/1996
Benzo[a]pyrene	50-32-8	6/12/1996
Benzo[b]fluoranthene	205-99-2	6/12/1996
Benzo[j]fluoranthene	205-82-3	6/12/1996
Benzo[k]fluoranthene	207-08-9	6/12/1996

**Table I – continued**

**Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Carcinogenic Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Chrysene	218-01-9	6/12/1996
Dibenz[a,h]acridine	226-36-8	6/12/1996
Dibenz[a,j]acridine	224-42-0	6/12/1996
Dibenz[a,h]anthracene	53-70-3	6/12/1996
Dibenzo[a,e]pyrene	192-65-4	6/12/1996
Dibenzo[a,h]pyrene	189-64-0	6/12/1996
Dibenzo[a,i]pyrene	189-55-9	6/12/1996
Dibenzo[a,l]pyrene	191-30-0	6/12/1996
7h-dibenzo[c,g]carbazole	194-59-2	6/12/1996
7,12-dimethylbenz[a]anthracene	57-97-6	6/12/1996
1,6-dinitropyrene	42397-64-8	6/12/1996
1,8-dinitropyrene	42397-65-9	6/12/1996
Indeno[1,2,3-c,d]pyrene	193-39-5	6/12/1996
3-methylcholanthrene	56-49-5	6/12/1996
5-methylchrysene	3697-24-3	6/12/1996
Naphthalene	91-20-3	8/03/2004
5-nitroacenaphthene	602-87-9	6/12/1996
6-nitrochrysene	7496-02-8	6/12/1996
2-nitrofluorene	607-57-8	6/12/1996
1-nitropyrene	5522-43-0	6/12/1996
4-nitropyrene	57835-92-4	6/12/1996
1,3-propane sultone	1120-71-4	1/11/2001
Propylene oxide	75-56-9	6/12/1996
Tertiary butyl-acetate (TBAc)	540-88-5	5/29/2019
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	79-34-5	1/11/2001
Thioacetamide	62-55-5	6/12/1996
Toluene diisocyanates including, but not limited to:	26471-62-5	1/11/2001
Toluene-2,4-diisocyanate	584-84-9	1/11/2001
Toluene-2,6-diisocyanate	91-08-7	1/11/2001
1,1,2-Trichloroethane (vinyl trichloride)	79-00-5	1/11/2001
Trichlorethylene	79-01-6	6/12/1996
Urethane (ethyl carbamate)	51-79-6	6/12/1996
Vinyl chloride (chloroethylene)	75-01-4	6/12/1996

- a. Unit Risk Values shall be obtained from the CAPCOA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, October 1993 or any health risk assessment guidelines adopted by the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), pursuant to Division 26, Part 6, Chapter 6 of the California Health and Safety Code (SB 1731 program), that replace all or part of such CAPCOA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, October 1993. Table I was last revised pursuant to Rule 1200(c)(23) on 2/26/21 and Rule 1210(c)(18-21-23) on February 26, 2021 (date of adoption).
- b. Chemical Abstract Service Number (CAS): For chemical groupings and mixtures where a CAS number is not applicable, the 4-digit code used in the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Emission Inventory Criteria and Guidelines (EICG) Report is listed. For information on the origin and use of the 4-digit code, see the EICG report.

**Table II****Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Chronic Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Acetaldehyde	75-07-0	6/12/1996
Acrolein	107-02-8	1/11/2001
Acrylonitrile	107-13-1	6/12/1996
Ammonia	7664-41-7	6/12/1996
Arsenic (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-38-2	6/12/1996
Arsine	7784-42-1	6/12/1996
Benzene	71-43-2	6/12/1996
Beryllium and compounds	7440-41-7	6/12/1996
1,3-butadiene	106-99-0	1/11/2001
Cadmium and compounds	7440-43-9	6/12/1996
Caprolactam	105-60-2	6/16/2014
Carbon disulfide	75-15-0	1/11/2001
Carbon tetrachloride (tetrachloromethane)	56-23-5	6/12/1996
Carbonyl sulfide	463-58-1	7/11/2017
Chlorine	7782-50-5	6/12/1996
Chlorine dioxide	10049-04-4	1/11/2001
Chlorobenzene	108-90-7	6/12/1996
Chloroform	67-66-3	6/12/1996
Chloropicrin	76-06-2	6/12/1996
Chromium (hexavalent) and compounds including, but not limited to:	18540-29-9	6/12/1996
Barium chromate	10294-40-3	6/12/1996
Calcium chromate	13765-19-0	6/12/1996
Lead chromate	7758-97-6	6/12/1996
Sodium dichromate	10588-01-9	6/12/1996
Strontium chromate	7789-06-2	6/12/1996
Chromium trioxide (as chromic acid mist)	1333-82-0	3/12/2001
Cresols (mixtures of)	1319-77-3	6/12/1996
m-cresol	108-39-4	6/12/1996
o-cresol	95-48-7	6/12/1996
p-cresol	106-44-5	6/12/1996
Cyanide (inorganic)	57-12-5	1/11/2001
Hydrogen cyanide (hydrocyanic acid)	74-90-8	6/12/1996
P – dichlorobenzene (1,4-dichlorobenzene)	106-46-7	6/12/1996
Diethanolamine	111-42-2	1/14/2002
N,n-dimethyl formamide	68-12-2	1/11/2001
1,4-dioxane	123-91-1	6/12/1996
Epichlorohydrin (1-chloro-2,3-epoxypropane)	106-89-8	6/12/1996
1,2-epoxybutane	106-88-7	1/11/2001
Ethyl benzene	100-41-4	1/11/2001
Ethyl chloride	75-00-3	6/12/1996
Ethylene dibromide (1,2-Dibromoethane)	106-93-4	6/12/1996
Ethylene dichloride (1,2-Dichloroethane)	107-06-2	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol	107-21-1	6/12/1996
Ethylene oxide	75-21-8	6/12/1996

**Table II – continued**

Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Chronic Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS #<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Fluorides and Compounds	1101	1/11/2001
Hydrogen fluoride (hydrofluoric acid)	7664-39-3	6/12/1996
Formaldehyde	50-00-0	6/12/1996
Glutaraldehyde	111-30-8	6/12/1996
Glycol Ethers as follows:	N/A	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol butyl ether – EGBE	111-76-2	7/19/2018
Ethylene glycol ethyl ether – EGEE	110-80-5	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol ethyl ether acetate – EGEEA	111-15-9	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol methyl ether – EGME	109-86-4	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol methyl ether acetate – EGMEA	110-49-6	6/12/1996
1,6-hexamethylene diisocyanate (monomer)	822-06-0	9/29/2020
n-Hexane	110-54-3	1/11/2001
Hydrazine	302-01-2	6/12/1996
Hydrochloric acid	7647-01-0	6/12/1996
Hydrogen sulfide	7783-06-4	6/12/1996
Isophorone	78-59-1	1/14/2002
Isopropyl alcohol (Isopropanol)	67-63-0	1/11/2001
Maleic anhydride	108-31-6	6/12/1996
Manganese	7439-96-5	6/12/1996
Mercury (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7439-97-6	6/12/1996
Mercuric chloride	7487-94-7	6/12/1996
Methanol	67-56-1	6/12/1996
Methyl bromide (Bromomethane)	74-83-9	6/12/1996
Methyl tert-butyl ether	1634-04-4	1/11/2001
Methyl chloroform (1, 1, 1 – TCA)	71-55-6	6/12/1996
Methyl isocyanate	624-83-9	6/12/1996
Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane)	75-09-2	6/12/1996
4,4'-methylene dianiline (and its dichloride)	101-77-9	6/12/1996
Methylene diphenyl diisocyanate (Polymeric)	101-68-8	6/12/1996
Naphthalene	91-20-3	6/12/1996
Nickel and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-02-0	6/12/1996
Nickel acetate	373-02-4	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonate	3333-67-3	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonyl	13463-39-3	6/12/1996
Nickel hydroxide	12054-48-7	6/12/1996
Nickelocene	1271-28-9	6/12/1996
Nickel oxide	1313-99-1	6/12/1996
Nickel refinery dust from the pyrometallurgical process	1146	6/12/1996
Nickel subsulfide	12035-72-2	6/12/1996
Particulate emissions from diesel-fueled engines	9901	9/15/2000
Perchloroethylene (Tetrachloroethylene)	127-18-4	6/12/1996
Phenol	108-95-2	6/12/1996
Phosphine	7803-51-2	6/12/1996
Phosphoric acid	7664-38-2	6/12/1996
Phthalic anhydride	85-44-9	6/12/1996



**Table II – continued**

Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Chronic Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS #<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) speciated as follows:	N/A	
3,3',4,4'-tetrachlorobiphenyl	32598-13-3	8/29/2003
3,4,4',5-tetrachlorobiphenyl	70362-50-4	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4'-pentachlorobiphenyl	32598-14-4	8/29/2003
2,3,4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	74472-37-0	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	31508-00-6	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5'-pentachlorobiphenyl	65510-44-3	8/29/2003
3,3',4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl	57465-28-8	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5-hexachlorobiphenyl	38380-08-4	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	69782-90-7	8/29/2003
2,3',4,4',5,5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	52663-72-6	8/29/2003
3,3',4,4',5,5'-hexachlorobiphenyl	32774-16-6	8/29/2003
2,3,3',4,4',5,5'-heptachlorobiphenyl	39635-31-9	8/29/2003
Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD) as follows:	1086	6/12/1996
2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	1746-01-6	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	40321-76-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	39227-28-6	6/12/1996
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	57653-85-7	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	19408-74-3	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	35822-46-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-Octachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin	3268-87-9	6/12/1996
Polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDF) as follows:	1080	6/12/1996
2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzofuran	5120-73-19	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran	57117-41-6	6/12/1996
2,3,4,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran	57117-31-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	70648-26-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	57117-44-9	6/12/1996
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	72918-21-9	6/12/1996
2,3,4,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	60851-34-5	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzofuran	67562-39-4	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-Heptachlorodibenzofuran	55673-89-7	6/12/1996
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-Octachlorodibenzofuran	39001-02-0	6/12/1996
Propylene (propene)	115-07-1	1/11/2001
Propylene glycol monomethyl ether	107-98-2	6/12/1996
Propylene oxide	75-56-9	6/12/1996
Selenium including, but not limited to:	7782-49-2	6/12/1996
Selenium sulfide	7446-34-6	6/12/1996
Silica (crystalline, respirable)	1175	10/11/2013
Styrene	100-42-5	6/12/1996
Sulfuric acid	7664-93-9	7/11/2017
Sulfur trioxide	7446-71-9	7/11/2017
Toluene	108-88-3	6/12/1996
Toluene diisocyanates	26471-62-5	6/12/1996
Toluene-2,4-diisocyanate	584-84-9	6/12/1996
Toluene-2,6-diisocyanate	91-08-7	6/12/1996
Trichloroethylene	79-01-6	6/12/1996

**Table II – continued**

Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Chronic Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Triethylamine	121-44-8	1/11/2001
Vinyl acetate	108-05-4	1/11/2001
Vinylidene chloride	75-35-4	6/12/1996
Xylenes (mixed isomers)	1330-20-7	6/12/1996
m-Xylene	108-38-3	6/12/1996
o-Xylene	95-47-6	6/12/1996
p-Xylene	106-42-3	6/12/1996

- a. Reference Exposure Levels (RELs) and toxic endpoint information shall be obtained from ~~the CAPCOA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, October 1993~~ or any health risk assessment guidelines adopted by ~~the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), pursuant to Division 26, Part 6, Chapter 6 of the California Health and Safety Code (SB 1731 program), that replace all or part of such CAPCOA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, October 1993.~~ Table II was last revised pursuant to Rule 1200(c)(23) on 9/29/20 and Rule 1210(c)(48 ~~21=23~~) on September 29, 2020 (date of adoption).
- b. Chemical Abstract Service Number (CAS): For chemical groupings and mixtures where a CAS number is not applicable, the 4-digit code used in the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Emission Inventory Criteria and Guidelines (EICG) Report is listed. For information on the origin and use of the 4-digit code, see the EICG report.

**Table III**  
**Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Acute Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

<b>COMPOUND</b>	<b>CAS # <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Date Added</b>
Acetaldehyde	75-07-0	1/28/2009
Acrolein	107-02-8	1/11/2001
Acrylic acid	79-10-7	1/11/2001
Ammonia	7664-41-7	6/12/1996
Arsenic (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-38-2	6/12/1996
Arsine	7784-42-1	6/12/1996
Benzene	71-43-2	6/12/1996
Benzyl chloride	100-44-7	6/12/1996
1,3-butadiene	106-99-0	10/11/2013
Caprolactam	105-60-2	6/16/2014
Carbon disulfide	75-15-0	1/11/2001
Carbon monoxide	630-08-0	1/11/2001
Carbon tetrachloride (tetrachloromethane)	56-23-5	6/12/1996
Carbonyl sulfide	463-58-1	7/11/2017
Chlorine	7782-50-5	6/12/1996
Chloroform	67-66-3	6/12/1996
Chloropicrin	76-06-2	1/11/2001
Copper and compounds	7440-50-8	6/12/1996
Cyanide (inorganic)	57-12-5	6/12/1996
Hydrogen cyanide (hydrocyanic acid)	74-90-8	6/12/1996
1,4-Dioxane (1,4-diethylene dioxide)	123-91-1	6/12/1996
Epichlorohydrin (1-chloro-2,3-epoxypropane)	106-89-8	1/11/2001
Fluorides and Compounds	1101	6/12/1996
Hydrogen fluoride (hydrofluoric acid)	7664-39-3	6/12/1996
Formaldehyde	50-00-0	6/12/1996
Glycol ethers as follows:	N/A	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol butyl ether - EGBE	111-76-2	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol ethyl ether - EGEE	110-80-5	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol ethyl ether acetate - EGEEA	111-15-9	6/12/1996
Ethylene glycol methyl ether - EGME	109-86-4	6/12/1996
1,6-hexamethylene diisocyanate (monomer)	822-06-0	9/29/2020
Hydrochloric acid (hydrogen chloride)	7647-01-0	6/12/1996
Hydrogen selenide	7783-07-5	6/12/1996
Hydrogen sulfide	7783-06-4	6/12/1996
Isopropyl alcohol (isopropanol)	67-63-0	1/11/2001
Mercury (inorganic) and compounds including, but not limited to:	7439-97-6	6/12/1996
Mercuric chloride	7487-94-7	6/12/1996
Methanol	67-56-1	1/11/2001
Methyl bromide (bromomethane)	74-83-9	6/12/1996
Methyl chloroform (1,1,1-trichloroethane)	71-55-6	6/12/1996
Methyl ethyl ketone (2-butanone)	78-93-3	1/11/2001
Methylene chloride (dichloromethane)	75-09-2	6/12/1996
Methylene diphenyl diisocyanate (Polymeric)	101-68-8	6/14/2016

**Table III – continued**  
**Toxic Air Contaminants For Which Potential Acute Noncancer Impacts Must Be Calculated<sup>a</sup>**

COMPOUND	CAS # <sup>b</sup>	Date Added
Nickel and compounds including, but not limited to:	7440-02-0	6/12/1996
Nickel acetate	373-02-4	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonate	3333-67-3	6/12/1996
Nickel carbonyl	13463-39-3	6/12/1996
Nickel hydroxide	12054-48-7	6/12/1996
Nickelocene	1271-28-9	6/12/1996
Nickel oxide	1313-99-1	6/12/1996
Nickel refinery dust from the pyrometallurgical process	1146	6/12/1996
Nickel subsulfide	12035-72-2	6/12/1996
Nitric acid	7697-37-2	1/11/2001
Nitrogen dioxide	10102-44-0	6/12/1996
Ozone	10028-15-6	6/12/1996
Perchloroethylene (tetrachloroethylene)	127-18-4	6/12/1996
Phenol	108-95-2	1/11/2001
Phosgene	75-44-5	6/12/1996
Propylene oxide	75-56-9	6/12/1996
Sodium hydroxide	1310-73-2	6/12/1996
Styrene	100-42-5	1/11/2001
Sulfates	9960	6/12/1996
Sulfur dioxide	7446-09-5	6/12/1996
Sulfuric acid and oleum	N/A	6/12/1996
Sulfuric acid	7664-93-9	6/12/1996
Sulfur trioxide	7446-71-9	6/12/1996
Oleum	8014-95-7	6/12/1996
Toluene	108-88-3	1/11/2001
Toluene diisocyanates	26471-62-5	6/14/2016
Toluene-2,4-diisocyanate	584-84-9	6/14/2016
Toluene-2,6-diisocyanate	91-08-7	6/14/2016
Triethylamine	121-44-8	1/11/2001
Vanadium (fume or dust)	7440-62-2	1/11/2001
Vanadium pentoxide	1314-62-1	1/11/2001
Vinyl chloride (chloroethylene)	75-01-4	1/11/2001
Xylenes (mixed isomers)	1330-20-7	6/12/1996
m-Xylene	108-38-3	6/12/1996
o-Xylene	95-47-6	6/12/1996
p-Xylene	106-42-3	6/12/1996

- a. Reference Exposure Levels (RELs) and toxic endpoint information shall be obtained from ~~the CAPCOA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, October 1993 or any health risk assessment guidelines adopted by the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), pursuant to Division 26, Part 6, Chapter 6 of the California Health and Safety Code (SB 1731 program), that replace all or part of such CAPCOA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, October 1993.~~ Table III was last revised pursuant to Rule 1200(c)(23) on 9/29/20 and Rule 1210(c)(18-~~21-23~~) on September 29, 2020 (date of adoption).
- b. Chemical Abstract Service Number (CAS): For chemical groupings and mixtures where a CAS number is not applicable, the 4-digit code used in the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Emission Inventory Criteria and Guidelines (EICG) Report is listed. For information on the origin and use of the 4-digit code, see the EICG

report.