



March 29, 2019

Dave Edwards, Assistant Division Chief  
CalEPA  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95812

**Re: Comments on the Criteria Pollutant and Toxics Emissions Reporting Regulation**

Dear Mr. Edwards,

Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability is an environmental justice nonprofit that works with rural and low-income communities that are disproportionately impacted by environmental degradation and pollution. We appreciate the overarching goal of the new CTR regulation to create a more consistent, complete, accurate, and transparent inventory of greenhouse gas emissions, criteria air pollutant emissions, and air toxics emissions.

First, we would like to express our support for several aspects of the reporting regulation, including:

- Annual reporting of emissions (at a minimum)
- The specific inclusion of fugitive emissions
- Established deadlines and a stronger mandate for reporting
- Making this a statewide reporting regulation

Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability strongly encourages you to consider the following two items:

1. All sources of emissions that have been authorized by CARB or the air districts should be included in the reporting requirements. As it currently stands, the CTR regulation only requires reporting from permitted facilities and sources. This is problematic. While a single source of pollution might have negligible health impacts on its own, when combined with other sources of pollution the cumulative impact on communities can be significant. This is the same reason why we believe that no facility should have an “off ramp” from reporting. It’s our understanding that a facility could be exempt from reporting if they have an approved risk assessment. However, again, even if a facility poses little risk on its own, the source or facility does contribute to the cumulative health impacts of the region.

Furthermore, it’s important to include all sources in the inventory to create a baseline for the purposes of tracking changes over time. And finally, it’s important to know what is currently known and unknown about emissions sources. This allows for the identification and assessment of data gaps. If the new rule excludes some sources from the full annual reporting, it should at the very least

require air districts to submit whatever they *do* and *do not* know about these emission sources. Every source should be counted, even if they are not all subject to the same reporting requirements.

2. Pesticides and other area-wide sources of pollution need to be included in the assessment of localized impacts. Residents of the communities where we work are intimately familiar with the health impacts of pesticides on them and their families. Currently, there is no provision in the rule to address the issue of pesticides. This is a glaring omission and we ask that the Board include pesticides from stationary sources in the reporting requirements and inventory. This would support the current AB 617 work. Communities selected for the Community Air Protection Program are already raising the issue of pesticides and area-wide contaminants in their air monitoring plans and community emissions reduction plans. Pesticides will no doubt be a recurring issue in future years of the program. The CTR regulation is an opportunity to address this issue now.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Aidan Smith

Policy Coordinator

Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability  
764 P Street, Suite 012  
Fresno, CA 93721