

From: dfgassman@aol.com
To: [ARB Clerk of the Board](#)
Subject: Guidance for the "Hot Spots" program.
Date: Wednesday, April 14, 2021 7:48:38 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am concerned about the impacts of air toxics on communities. These compounds can cause impacts at very low doses, and it is important to take them seriously.

Many air toxics affect children at sensitive stages of development. We need to avoid hurting children with toxic contaminants.

Some of the air toxics are persistent in our communities and accumulate over time in our bodies.

I am concerned about all the emerging pollutants that are being brought to our community – like the PFAS chemicals that are called “forever chemicals” because they never break down. But they cause cancer and many other effects.

I want the industries to report all of the chemicals that they are discharging to we can make sure that harmful discharges are reduced.

Every draft of this rule extends the deadlines for compliance with reporting. What are we doing in the meantime while this pollution goes on? We need to get the information and then start reducing emissions.

CARB should base its decisions and actions on science. Saying that pollutants don't matter because agencies have not set health values yet is not truthful or scientific. All of the pollutants listed should be reported.

CARB has it backwards by saying that air toxics without health values don't need to be reported. They do need to be reported. This can still identify those that emit a lot of toxics. You can see the pattern without a health value.

Taking out toxic pollutants that cause cancer and other problems leaves our communities at risk. These should all be included in the reporting so we know what is out there.

The new draft of the rules removes the language about considering the impacts of multiple facilities that affect the same area. This was important to communities and should be put back in the rule.

CARB says that it is going to address disproportionate impacts and environmental justice. But then CARB has taken out of the rule the language about considering effects from multiple facilities. That will continue the disproportionate impacts.

CARB and the districts need to write the rules and do the assessments based on the conditions that are actually occurring. This includes consideration of different sources that affect an area.

We consider effects of multiple facilities for criteria pollutants. We need to do it for toxics as well.

David F. Gassman 389 Belmont Street #111 Oakland, CA 94610 Home: 510-835-2334 Email: dfgassman@aol.com