

**Sacramento Regional
8-Hour Ozone Attainment And
Reasonable Further Progress Plan And
Environmental Impact Report**

Public Comments and Staff Responses at the Public Hearing

**February 10, 2009
Placerville, California**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public Hearing Comments (Placerville, El Dorado County -- Feb 10, 2009)

Comment 1: Dale Einsworth – Clean Air Partnership

Clean Air Partnership supports adoption of the proposed SIP documents.

Response: *Comment noted.*

Comment 2: Judy Matthis – El Dorado County Resident

Pollution is being transported into El Dorado County from Sacramento. El Dorado County should be receiving “credits” for numerous activities that minimize pollution generation such as “green building” and forest fuel management.

Response: *Chapter 9 of the plan discusses pollutant transport. The pollution reduction activities are already included in the plan to the extent that they are reflected in SACOG's Metropolitan Transportation Plan.*

Comment 3: Jack Lindalh – President, Breathe California and El Dorado County Resident

Breathe California of Sacramento Emigrant Trails supports adoption of the proposed SIP documents.

Response: *Comment noted.*

Comment 4: Bob Johnson – El Dorado County Resident

El Dorado County is being blackmailed into adopting the proposed SIP. New compliant coating products are not as effective and do not last as long as previous products. Therefore, they are more costly to the residents. While new products may reduce pollution, the tiny reduction is insignificant in face of natural disasters such as wild fires.

Response: *Several studies have been conducted to evaluate the potential for more frequent recoating and other issues associated with new coating formulations. The conclusion of those studies was that the air quality benefits of the reformulation outweighed the potential disbenefits from any coating quality issues. These relevant studies were discussed in the EIR for this plan beginning on page 3-23.*

Comment 5: Sue Taylor – El Dorado County Resident, Designer

Concerned about the types of coating products that will be affected by new regulations and that new and less effective products will have negative economic impact on residents and industries in El Dorado County.

Response: *Each of the control measures committed to in the plan must undergo a subsequent public process before being adopted by the Board of Directors. State law requires that costs be evaluated, and disclosed, as part of that process. The coating rules committed to in El Dorado County, Architectural Coatings and Miscellaneous Metal Parts, have been implemented in other urban areas in California, and in some cases the nation, for many years.*

Comment 6: Jason Crow, Senior Planner of Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)

SACOG supports the adoption of the proposed SIP documents. The SIP is important since all of the SACOG transportation plans and programs adopted for the region must demonstrate conformity. Without the SIP budgets, SACOG cannot demonstrate conformity and the region will enter into a conformity lapse. Basically, the conformity lapse means federal transportation dollars will be cut off and federal agencies cannot approve environmental documents. The potential impacts of not acting would be huge and SACOG feels that the timing is critical.

Response: *Comment noted.*

Comment 7: Camille Custan – Environmental Fund

The Environmental Fund organization supports the adoption of the proposed SIP documents.

Response: *Comment noted.*

Comment 8: Becky Woods – Teichert, Member of Clean Air Partnership

Teichert supports the adoption of the proposed SIP documents. Expressed concern that the proposed automotive refinishing control measure would be adopted everywhere in the Sacramento region except El Dorado County. Also a new asphalt plant control measure proposed in the SIP was being planned for adoption everywhere but El Dorado and Yolo Counties. It was recognized that adoption in El Dorado County not significant, since there is no asphalt plant.

Response: *Comment regarding the potential inequity of the automotive refinishing rule in the El Dorado County AQMD is noted. With respect to the measure's air quality benefits, the El Dorado County AQMD analysis of reasonably available control measures determined that the more stringent automotive refinishing requirements would provide minimal VOC emission reductions, and therefore did not recommend this measure for SIP adoption. These reductions were also included in the RACM evaluation.*

Comment 9: **Art Marinachio – El Dorado County Tax Payers Association, Resident**

El Dorado County is being extorted into adopting the proposed SIP documents. The documents do not articulate the cost to El Dorado County for implementing the SIP. There must be a clear message to Sacramento and Washington, that new rules and regulations cannot be just piled on top of each other without a providing cost analysis to the County associated with compliance.

Response: *The cost effectiveness of each control measure is discussed in the Plan Appendix C. Regulatory cost discussions relevant to El Dorado County begin on page C-68. In addition, each of the control measures committed to in the plan must undergo a subsequent public process before being adopted by the Board of Directors. State law requires that costs be evaluated, and disclosed, as part of that process.*