January 16, 2009

Dear Mr. Peterson:

Comments on the Governor’s OPR Preliminary Draft CEQA Guideline Amendments for Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Sanitation Districts) appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) efforts to amend the CEQA Guidelines to incorporate climate change concerns into CEQA policy. The Sanitation Districts provide environmentally sound, cost-effective wastewater and solid waste management for about 5.3 million people in Los Angeles County and, in the process, convert waste into resources such as reclaimed water, energy, and recycled materials. The Sanitation Districts' service area covers approximately 800 square miles and encompasses 78 cities and unincorporated territory within the County through a partnership agreement with 24 independent special districts. The Sanitation Districts serve as Lead Agency in the CEQA review for their projects and much of the CEQA review is completed by Sanitation Districts’ staff.

We respectfully offer the following comments on the January 8, 2009, Preliminary Draft CEQA Guideline Amendments for Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

1. On page 3, OPR seems to acknowledge that a programmatic rather than project-specific approach mitigating GHG may be more effective for agencies. The Sanitation Districts agree with this point and encourage that the flexibility for programmatic mitigation be implemented.

2. More specific comments to the proposed amendments to the CEQA Guidelines are as follows:

   i. §15093 (d) states, “When an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the agency may consider local adverse environmental effects in the context of region-wide or statewide benefits” [emphasis added]. We believe the word “local” should be removed; otherwise, this section would not apply to a non-local impact like global warming from GHG.
ii. §15126.4 (c)(2) should be amended as follows to allow for programmatic mitigation: “Mitigation measures may include project features, project design, other measures, or programmatic actions by the proponent that substantially reduce energy consumption or greenhouse gas emissions, or increase carbon sequestration.”

iii. §15130 (f): This text regarding assessment of cumulative impacts is unclear and does not address the argument by some that “one more molecule of pollution in our currently overstressed environment is not acceptable and is a significant impact.” More direction is requested from OPR and/or CARB on this issue.

iv. §15364.5 provides a definition of greenhouse gases. We propose that this definition is expanded to clarify that, for the purposes of CEQA analysis, only anthropogenic GHG emissions should be counted.

Again, we thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments and allow our participation in this important process. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please do not hesitate to contact Lysa Aposhian at (562) 908-4288, extension 2707, or Laposhian@lacsd.org.

Very truly yours,

Stephen R. Maguin
Bryan T. Langpap
Supervising Engineer
Planning Section

cc: Patrick Griffith