

T 510.836.4200 F 510.836.4205 1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150 Oakland, CA 94612 www.lozeaudrury.com brian@lozeaudrury.com

VIA EMAIL

September 27, 2024

Robin Estanislau, City Clerk City Clerk's Office City of Huntington Beach 2000 Main Street Huntington Beach, CA 92648 Robin.Estanislau@surfcity-hb.org

Re: Appeal of the Decision of the Planning Commission to Approve the Conditional Use Permit No. 21-024 for the Bolsa Chica Senior Care Community

Dear City Clerk Estanislau,

I am writing on behalf of the Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER") and its members living and/or working in or around the City of Huntington Beach ("City") to appeal the Planning Commission's decisions of September 24, 2024, to approve Conditional Use Permit No. 21-024 for the Bolsa Chica Senior Care Community, a proposed fivestory senior care center located at 4952 and 4972 Warner Avenue, 92649 (Southwest corner of Bolsa Chica Street and Warner Avenue), in the City of Huntington Beach ("Project"), and to certify the Revised EIR (No. 21-004) prepared for the Project.

This appeal is timely filed within 10 days of the Planning Commission's decision and is accompanied by the required filing fee of \$4,323. The reasons for the appeal are set forth in the attached letter dated September 10, 2024, which was submitted to the Planning Commission prior to its decision.

Sincerely,

Brian Flynn LOZEAU DRURY LLP

EXHIBIT A



T 510.836.4200 F 510.836.4205 1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150 Oakland, CA 94612 www.lozeaudrury.com brian@lozeaudrury.com

September 10, 2024

VIA E-MAIL

Butch Twining, Chair Don Kennedy, Vice-Chair Kayla Acosta-Galvan Oscar Rodriguez Ian Adam Rick Wood Tracy Pellman Planning Commission City of Huntington Beach 2000 Main Street Huntington Beach, CA 92648 planning.commission@surfcity-hb.org Hayden Beckman, Senior Planner Planning Division City of Huntington Beach 2000 Main Street Huntington Beach, CA 92648 hayden.beckman@surfcity-hb.org

Re: SAFER Comment on Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project Revised Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2022110040) HEARING ITEM 24-596 (September 10, 2024)

To Chair Twining, Vice-Chair Kennedy, Planning Commissioners, and Planner Beckman:

This comment is submitted on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER") and its members living in and around the City of Huntington Beach ("City") regarding the revised environmental impact report ("REIR") prepared for the Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project ("Project") to be heard as Public Hearing Item 24-596 at the Planning Commission's September 10, 2024 meeting.

The Planning Commission should refrain from taking any action on the Project at this time because the Final REIR failed to respond to SAFER's timely submitted comment on the Draft REIR and, therefore, the Final REIR does not comply with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").

The Project's Draft REIR was circulated for public comment from June 20, 2024 to August 5, 2024. (Draft REIR, p. 2.3.) The Draft REIR stated that comments could be submitted by email to Senior Planner Hayden Beckham at hayden.beckman@surfcity-hb.org. On August 5, 2024, I emailed Senior Planner Beckham at hayden.beckman@surfcity-hb.org on behalf of SAFER and attached a written comment on the Draft REIR to the email. A true and correct copy SAFER Comment Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community EIR Public Hearing Item 24-596 September 10, 2024 Page 2 of 2

of the August 5, 2024 email to Senior Planner Beckham is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. A true and correct copy of SAFER's August 5, 2024 comment, which was attached to the email, is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

CEQA requires that the City evaluate comments on a draft EIR *and prepare written responses for inclusion in the final EIR*. (Pub. Res. Code, § 21091(d); 14 CCR §§ 15088(a), 15132.) The written responses must describe the disposition of any "significant environmental issues" raised by commentators. (Pub. Res. Code, § 21091(d)(2)(B); 14 CCR §§ 15088(c), 15132(d), 15204(a).)

Despite SAFER's timely submitted comment on the Draft REIR, the Final REIR does not include SAFER's comment or the City's response. (See Final REIR, pp. 1-4 [List of Comments Received].) This is a clear violation of CEQA that must be fixed before the Project can proceed.

Importantly, it is immaterial that the Planning Commission is only making a recommendation on the EIR and various Project entitlements to the City Council at this time. The Planning Commission will be making a discretionary decision on the Project's conditional use permit ("CUP") at tonight's hearing. CEQA is clear that compliance with CEQA must occur *prior to* any approval of a project. (See 14 CCR § 15090(a)(1).) As such, the Planning Commission cannot approve the CUP until a legally adequate Final REIR—that responds to SAFER's timely submitted comment—has been prepared.

For the above reasons and those discussed in SAFER's comment on the Draft REIR, SAFER respectfully requests that the Planning Commission take no action on the Project until the City prepares a legally adequate REIR.

Sincerely,

Brian BHym

Brian Flynn Lozeau | Drury LLP

EXHIBIT 1



Brian Flynn <brian@lozeaudrury.com>

Comment: Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project - Revised DEIR

Brian Flynn <brian@lozeaudrury.com>

Mon, Aug 5, 2024 at 5:02 PM

To: hayden.beckman@surfcity-hb.org Cc: Rebecca Davis <rebecca@lozeaudrury.com>, Madeline Dawson <madeline@lozeaudrury.com>, Chase Preciado <Chase@lozeaudrury.com>

Dear Senior Planner Beckman:

Please find attached a comment submitted on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER) and its members living in and around the City of Huntington Beach regarding the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project (SCH #2022110040).

Acknowledgment of receipt of this email and attached comment would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you, Brian B. Flynn Lozeau | Drury LLP 1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150 Oakland, California 94612 (510) 836-4200 (510) 836-4205 (fax) brian@lozeaudrury.com

2024.08.05 SAFER Comment_Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community_RDEIR.pdf 655K

EXHIBIT 2



T 510.836.4200 F 510.836.4205 1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150 Oakland, CA 94612 www.lozeaudrury.com brian@lozeaudrury.com

August 5, 2024

VIA E-MAIL

Hayden Beckman, Senior Planner City of Huntington Beach Planning Division Advance Planning 2000 Main Street Huntington Beach, CA 92648 hayden.beckman@surfcity-hb.org

Re: SAFER Comment on Revised Draft EIR (SCH #2022110040) Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project

Dear Senior Planner Beckman:

This comment is submitted on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER") and its members living in and around the City of Huntington Beach regarding the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report ("RDEIR") prepared for the Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project ("Project").

SAFER's review of the RDEIR was assisted by indoor air quality expert Francis Offermann. CIH, whose written comment and CV is attached as Exhibit A.

For the reasons discussed below, the City lacks substantial evidence to support the EIR's conclusion that the Project will not have a significant impact on air quality. Additionally, the EIR is inadequate under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") for failing to consider how feasible renewable energy (such as roof top solar) could be incorporated into the Project. For those reasons, SAFER respectfully requests that the RDEIR be revised and recirculated prior to any action being taken on the Project.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The Project proposes (1) a Zoning Text Amendment to establish the Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Specific Plan with development standards for height, open space, and convalescent uses on the Project site, (2) a General Plan Amendment to re-designate the site from Commercial General (CG) to Mixed Use (MU) with a Specific Plan Overlay, (3) a Zoning Map Amendment to re-designate the site from Commercial General (CG) to Specific Plan 19 (SP-19), and (4) a Conditional Use Permit to demolish 50,000 sq. ft. of existing commercial space and construct a senior living facility ("Facility") with on-site alcohol sales and SAFER Comment Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community EIR August 5, 2024 Page 2 of 7

consumption with a subterranean parking garage and associated hardscape and landscape improvements.

In May 2023, the City circulated a draft EIR ("DEIR") for the Project, at which time the Facility was proposed to have 5 stories (65 feet in height maximum), 202 units, and 196 parking spaces. The City released a final EIR ("FEIR") in September 2023. On September 26, 2023, the Planning Commission approved the Project's CUP and recommended that the City Council certify the EIR and approve the Project's GPA, ZMA, and ZTA. On December 19, 2023, the City Council voted to continue the Project to a date uncertain at the request of the applicant. In June 2024, the City released the RDEIR with a public comment period from June 20, 2024 to August 5, 2024.

The project proposed in the original EIR included the construction of a five-story, 298,000-square-foot senior living community consisting of 213 total living units on an approximately 3.10-acre site. The Modified Project, as analyzed in the RDEIR, reduces the height and scale of the original project to include the construction of a four-story, 200,000-square-foot senior living community consisting of 159 total living units. The Modified Project includes 98,000 fewer square feet and 54 fewer living units than the Original Project, reduces the height of the project from 65 feet to 50 feet, and reduces the project floor area ratio.

The 3.10-acre project site is located at the southwest corner of Bolsa Chica Street and Warner Avenue in the City of Huntington Beach (APNs 163-281-01 and APN 163-281-02). The Project site is currently fully developed with commercial (retail and office) uses and an associated surface parking lot. The existing commercial and retail uses total approximately 55,000 square feet and are contained in two buildings comprised of a three-story office building fronting Bolsa Chica Street and a smaller retail commercial building fronting Warner Avenue. Development of the Project includes demolition of the existing on-site structures and the removal of the surface parking and existing ornamental landscaping. A total of 104 parking spaces will be provided, 19 of which would be surface (at grade) parking spaces (at grade) and 85 of which would be in a single-level half-subterranean parking garage approximately 5 feet below beneath approximately half of the senior living community.

II. LEGAL STANDARD UNDER CEQA

CEQA requires that an agency analyze the potential environmental impacts of its proposed actions in an EIR except in certain limited circumstances. The EIR is the very heart of CEQA. (*Dunn-Edwards v. BAAQMD* (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 644, 652.) "The 'foremost principle' in interpreting CEQA is that the Legislature intended the act to be read so as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language." (*Communities for a Better Envt. v. Cal. Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 109.)

CEQA has two primary purposes. First, CEQA is designed to inform decision makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of a project. (14 CCR 15002(a)(1).) "Its purpose is to inform the public and its responsible officials of the

SAFER Comment Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community EIR August 5, 2024 Page 3 of 7

environmental consequences of their decisions before they are made. Thus, the EIR 'protects not only the environment but also informed self-government.'" (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 564.) The EIR has been described as "an environmental 'alarm bell' whose purpose it is to alert the public and its responsible officials to environmental changes before they have reached ecological points of no return." *Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay v. Bd. of Port Comm'rs.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1354 (*Berkeley Jets*); *County of Inyo v. Yorty* (1973) 32 Cal.App.3d 795, 810.)

Second, CEQA requires public agencies to avoid or reduce environmental damage when "feasible" by requiring "environmentally superior" alternatives and all feasible mitigation measures. (14 CCR § 15002(a)(2), (3); *see also*, *Berkeley Jets*, *supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1354; *Citizens of Goleta Valley*, *supra*, 52 Cal.3d at 564.) The EIR serves to provide agencies and the public with information about the environmental impacts of a proposed project and to "identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced." (14 CCR 15002(a)(2). If the project will have a significant effect on the environment, the agency may approve the project only if it finds that it has "eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment are "acceptable due to overriding concerns." (PRC § 21081; 14 CCR 15092(b)(2)(A), (B).) The lead agency may deem a particular impact to be insignificant only if it produces rigorous analysis and concrete substantial evidence justifying the finding. (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 732.)

The EIR is the very heart of CEQA "and the integrity of the process is dependent on the adequacy of the EIR." (*Berkeley Jets, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 1355.) CEQA requires that a lead agency analyze all potentially significant environmental impacts of its proposed actions in an EIR. (PRC § 21100(b)(1); 14 CCR 15126(a); *Berkeley Jets, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 1354.) The EIR must not only identify the impacts, but must also provide "information about how adverse the impacts will be." (*Santiago County Water Dist. v. County of Orange* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 818, 831.) The lead agency may deem a particular impact to be insignificant only if it produces rigorous analysis and concrete substantial evidence justifying the finding. (*Kings County Farm Bureau, supra*, 221 Cal.App.3d at 732.) "The 'foremost principle' in interpreting CEQA is that the Legislature intended the act to be read so as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language." (*Communities for a Better Envt., supra*, 103 Cal.App.4th at 109.)

While the courts review an EIR using an "abuse of discretion" standard, "the reviewing court is not to 'uncritically rely on every study or analysis presented by a project proponent in support of its position. A 'clearly inadequate or unsupported study is entitled to no judicial deference." (*Berkeley Jets, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 1355 [quoting *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 391, 409 n. 12].) A prejudicial abuse of discretion occurs "if the failure to include relevant information precludes informed decisionmaking and informed public participation, thereby thwarting the statutory goals of the EIR process." (*San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Center v. County of Stanislaus* (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 713, 722; *Galante Vineyards v. Monterey Peninsula Water Mgmt. Dist.* (1997) 60

SAFER Comment Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community EIR August 5, 2024 Page 4 of 7

Cal.App.4th 1109, 1117; *County of Amador v. El Dorado Cnty. Water Agency* (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 931, 946.)

II. DISCUSSION

A. The EIR Fails to Disclose and Mitigate the Project's Significant Indoor Air Quality Impacts.

The RDEIR fails to discuss, disclose, analyze, and mitigate the significant health risks posed by the Project from formaldehyde, a toxic air contaminant ("TAC"). Certified Industrial Hygienist, Francis Offermann, PE, CIH, conducted a review of the Original Project, attached as Exhibit A. Although Mr. Offermann's comment was directed at the Original Project, his conclusions and recommendations remain applicable to the Modified Project

Mr. Offermann is one of the world's leading experts on indoor air quality, in particular emissions of formaldehyde, and has published extensively on the topic. As discussed below and set forth in Mr. Offermann's comments, the Project's emissions of formaldehyde to air will result in very significant cancer risks to future residents of the Facility's residential units. Mr. Offermann's expert opinion demonstrates the Project's significant health risk impacts, which the City has a duty to investigate, disclose, and mitigate in a recirculated EIR.

Formaldehyde is a known human carcinogen and listed by the State as a TAC. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District ("SDAPCD") has established a significance threshold of health risks for carcinogenic TACs of 10 in a million (Ex. A, p. 2.). The RDEIR fails to acknowledge the significant indoor air emissions that will result from the Project. Specifically, there is no discussion of impacts or health risks, no analysis, and no identification of mitigations for significant emissions of formaldehyde to air from the Project.

Mr. Offermann explains that many composite wood products typically used in home and apartment building construction contain formaldehyde-based glues which off-gas formaldehyde over a very long time period. He states, "The primary source of formaldehyde indoors is composite wood products manufactured with urea-formaldehyde resins, such as plywood, medium density fiberboard, and particle board. These materials are commonly used in residential, office, and retail building construction for flooring, cabinetry, baseboards, window shades, interior doors, and window and door trims." (Ex. A, pp. 2-3.)

Mr. Offermann found that future residents of the Project's residential units will be exposed to a cancer risk from formaldehyde of approximately 120 per million, *even assuming that* all materials are compliant with the California Air Resources Board's formaldehyde airborne toxics control measure. (Ex. A, pp. 4-5.) This is more than 12 times SCAPCD's CEQA significance threshold of 10 per million.

Mr. Offermann concludes that these significant environmental impacts must be analyzed in an EIR and mitigation measures should be imposed to reduce the risk of formaldehyde SAFER Comment Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community EIR August 5, 2024 Page 5 of 7

exposure. (Ex. A, pp. 5, 12-13.) He prescribes a methodology for estimating the Project's formaldehyde emissions in order to do a more project-specific health risk assessment. (*Id.*, pp. 5-10.). Mr. Offermann also suggests several feasible mitigation measures, such as requiring the use of no-added-formaldehyde composite wood products, which are readily available. (*Id.*, pp. 12-13.) Mr. Offermann also suggests requiring air ventilation systems which would reduce formaldehyde levels. (*Id.*) Since the RDEIR does not analyze this impact at all, none of these or other mitigation measures have been considered.

When a Project exceeds a duly adopted CEQA significance threshold, as here, this alone establishes substantial evidence that the project will have a significant adverse environmental impact. Indeed, in many instances, such air quality thresholds are the only criteria reviewed and treated as dispositive in evaluating the significance of a project's air quality impacts. (See, e.g. *Schenck v. County of Sonoma* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 949, 960 [County applies Air District's "published CEQA quantitative criteria" and "threshold level of cumulative significance"]; see *also Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 110-111 ["A 'threshold of significance' for a given environmental effect is simply that level at which the lead agency finds the effects of the project to be significant"].)

The California Supreme Court made clear the substantial importance that an air district significance threshold plays in providing substantial evidence of a significant adverse impact. (*Communities for a Better Environment v. South Coast Air Quality Management Dist.* (2010) 48 Cal.4th 310, 327 ["As the District's established significance threshold for NOx is 55 pounds per day, these estimates [of NOx emissions of 201 to 456 pounds per day] constitute substantial evidence supporting a fair argument for a significant adverse impact."].) Since expert evidence demonstrates that the Project will exceed the SDAPCD's CEQA significance threshold, there is substantial evidence that an "unstudied, *potentially significant environmental effect[]*" exists. (See *Friends of Coll. of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo Cty. Cmty. Coll. Dist.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 937, 958 [emphasis added].)

The failure of the RDEIR to address the Project's formaldehyde emissions is contrary to the California Supreme Court's decision in *California Building Industry Ass'n v. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist.* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 369, 386 ("*CBIA*"). In that case, the Supreme Court expressly holds that potential adverse impacts to future users and residents from pollution generated by a proposed project *must be addressed* under CEQA. At issue in *CBIA* was whether the Air District could enact CEQA guidelines that advised lead agencies that they must analyze the impacts of adjacent environmental conditions on a project. The Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require lead agencies to consider the environment's effects on a project. (*CBIA*, 62 Cal.4th at 800-01.) However, to the extent a project may exacerbate existing environmental conditions at or near a project site, those would still have to be considered pursuant to CEQA. (*Id.* at 801.) In so holding, the Court expressly held that CEQA's statutory language required lead agencies to disclose and analyze "impacts on *a project's users or residents* that arise *from the project's effects* on the environment." (*Id.* at 800 [emphasis added].)

SAFER Comment Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community EIR August 5, 2024 Page 6 of 7

The carcinogenic formaldehyde emissions identified by Mr. Offermann are not an existing environmental condition. Those emissions to the air will be from the Project. People will be residing in and working in the Project's buildings once built and emitting formaldehyde. Once built, the Project will begin to emit formaldehyde at levels that pose significant direct and cumulative health risks. The Supreme Court in *CBIA* expressly finds that this type of air emission and health impact by the project on the environment and a "project's users and residents" must be addressed in the CEQA process. The existing TAC sources near the Project site would have to be considered in evaluating the cumulative effect on future residents of both the Project's TAC emissions as well as those existing off-site emissions.

The Supreme Court's reasoning is well-grounded in CEQA's statutory language. CEQA expressly includes a project's effects on human beings as an effect on the environment that must be addressed in an environmental review. "Section 21083(b)(3)'s express language, for example, requires a finding of a 'significant effect on the environment' (§ 21083(b)) whenever the 'environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects *on human beings*, either directly or indirectly."" (*CBIA*, 62 Cal.4th at 800.) Likewise, "the Legislature has made clear—in declarations accompanying CEQA's enactment—that public health and safety are of great importance in the statutory scheme." (*Id.* [citing e.g., PRC §§ 21000, 21001].) It goes without saying that the future residents of the Project are human beings and their health and safety must be subject to CEQA's safeguards.

The City has a duty to investigate issues relating to a project's potential environmental impacts. (*See County Sanitation Dist. No. 2 v. County of Kern*, (2005) 127 Cal.App.4th 1544, 1597–98. ["[U]nder CEQA, the lead agency bears a burden to investigate potential environmental impacts."].) The proposed buildings will have significant impacts on air quality and health risks by emitting cancer-causing levels of formaldehyde into the air that will expose future residents to cancer risks potentially in excess of SDAPCD's threshold of significance for cancer health risks of 10 in a million. Currently, outside of Mr. Offermann's comments, the City does not have any idea what risks will be posed by formaldehyde emissions from the Project. As a result, the City must include an analysis and discussion in an updated EIR which discloses and analyzes the health risks that the Project's formaldehyde emissions may have on future residents and identifies appropriate mitigation measures.

B. The EIR's Analysis of the Project's Energy Impacts Is Inadequate.

CEQA provides that all Projects must include mitigation measures "to reduce the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy." (Pub. Res. Code § 21100(b)(3).) Energy conservation under CEQA is defined as the "wise and efficient use of energy." (CEQA Guidelines, app. F, § I.) The "wise and efficient use of energy" is achieved by "(1) decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, (2) decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas and oil, and (3) increasing reliance on renewable energy resources." (*Id.*)

Mere compliance with the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 24, part 6) ("Title 24") does not constitute an adequate analysis of energy. (*League to*

SAFER Comment Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community EIR August 5, 2024 Page 7 of 7

Save Lake Tahoe Mountain Area Preservation Foundation v. County of Placer (2022) 75 Cal.App.5th 63, 165 (League to Save Lake Tahoe); Ukiah Citizens for Safety First v. City of Ukiah (2016) 248 Cal. App. 4th 256, 264-65; California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 209-13.) Even where an agency has concluded that a project's impacts on energy resources would be less than significant, a lead agency must still analyze implementation of all "renewable energy options that might have been available or appropriate for [a] project." (League to Save Lake Tahoe, supra, 75 Cal.App.5th at 166-67.) A lead agency's failure to consider implementation of all feasible renewable energy proposals raised during the environmental review process constitutes a "prejudicial error." (Id. at 168.)

Despite CEQA's requirement to consider all renewable energy options—and despite the City's General Plan Policy to encourage the use of solar energy systems (RDEIR, pp. 4.4-7 to - 8), the RDEIR merely claims that the Project will comply with Title 24 requirements (*id.* at p. 4.4-10 to -13) and makes no mention of renewable energy options that could be incorporated into the Project. This is inadequate under CEQA and the RDEIR must be revised to include a good faith analysis of feasible renewable energy features that could be incorporated into the Project.

III. CONCLUSION

SAFER respectfully requests that the City revise and recirculate the RDEIR to address the deficiencies discussed above prior to any further action on the Project.

Sincerely,

Brian BHym

Brian Flynn Lozeau | Drury LLP

EXHIBIT A



INDOOR ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING



1448 Pine Street, Suite 103 San Francisco, California 94109 Telephone: (415) 567-7700 E-mail: <u>offermann@IEE-SF.com</u> <u>http://www.iee-sf.com</u>

Date:	December 17, 2023
То:	Brian Flynn Lozeau Drury LLP 1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150 Oakland, California 94612
From:	Francis J. Offermann PE CIH
Subject:	Indoor Air Quality: Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project, Huntington Beach, CA. (IEE File Reference: P-4772
Pages:	19

Indoor Air Quality Impacts

Indoor air quality (IAQ) directly impacts the comfort and health of building occupants, and the achievement of acceptable IAQ in newly constructed and renovated buildings is a well-recognized design objective. For example, IAQ is addressed by major high-performance building rating systems and building codes (California Building Standards Commission, 2014; USGBC, 2014). Indoor air quality in homes is particularly important because occupants, on average, spend approximately ninety percent of their time indoors with the majority of this time spent at home (EPA, 2011). Some segments of the population that are most susceptible to the effects of poor IAQ, such as the very young and the elderly, occupy their homes almost continuously. Additionally, an increasing number of adults are working from home at least some of the time during the workweek. Indoor air quality also is a serious concern for workers in hotels, offices and other business establishments.

The concentrations of many air pollutants often are elevated in homes and other buildings relative to outdoor air because many of the materials and products used indoors contain and release a variety of pollutants to air (Hodgson et al., 2002; Offermann and Hodgson,

2011). With respect to indoor air contaminants for which inhalation is the primary route of exposure, the critical design and construction parameters are the provision of adequate ventilation and the reduction of indoor sources of the contaminants.

Indoor Formaldehyde Concentrations Impact. In the California New Home Study (CNHS) of 108 new homes in California (Offermann, 2009), 25 air contaminants were measured, and formaldehyde was identified as the indoor air contaminant with the highest cancer risk as determined by the California Proposition 65 Safe Harbor Levels (OEHHA, 2017a), No Significant Risk Levels (NSRL) for carcinogens. The NSRL is the daily intake level calculated to result in one excess case of cancer in an exposed population of 100,000 (i.e., ten in one million cancer risk) and for formaldehyde is 40 μ g/day. The NSRL concentration of formaldehyde that represents a daily dose of 40 μ g is 2 μ g/m³, assuming a continuous 24-hour exposure, a total daily inhaled air volume of 20 m³, and 100% absorption by the respiratory system. All of the CNHS homes exceeded this NSRL concentration of 2 μ g/m³. The median indoor formaldehyde concentration was 36 μ g/m³, and ranged from 4.8 to 136 μ g/m³, which corresponds to a median exceedance of the 2 μ g/m³ NSRL concentration of 18 and a range of 2.3 to 68.

Therefore, the cancer risk of a resident living in a California home with the median indoor formaldehyde concentration of 36 μ g/m³, is 180 per million as a result of formaldehyde alone. The CEQA significance threshold for airborne cancer risk is 10 per million, as established by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD, 2021).

Besides being a human carcinogen, formaldehyde is also a potent eye and respiratory irritant. In the CNHS, many homes exceeded the non-cancer reference exposure levels (RELs) prescribed by California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA, 2017b). The percentage of homes exceeding the RELs ranged from 98% for the Chronic REL of 9 μ g/m³ to 28% for the Acute REL of 55 μ g/m³.

The primary source of formaldehyde indoors is composite wood products manufactured with urea-formaldehyde resins, such as plywood, medium density fiberboard, and

particleboard. These materials are commonly used in building construction for flooring, cabinetry, baseboards, window shades, interior doors, and window and door trims.

In January 2009, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted an airborne toxics control measure (ATCM) to reduce formaldehyde emissions from composite wood products, including hardwood plywood, particleboard, medium density fiberboard, and also furniture and other finished products made with these wood products (California Air Resources Board 2009). While this formaldehyde ATCM has resulted in reduced emissions from composite wood products sold in California, they do not preclude that homes built with composite wood products meeting the CARB ATCM will have indoor formaldehyde concentrations below cancer and non-cancer exposure guidelines.

A follow up study to the California New Home Study (CNHS) was conducted in 2016-2018 (Singer et. al., 2019), and found that the median indoor formaldehyde in new homes built after 2009 with CARB Phase 2 Formaldehyde ATCM materials had lower indoor formaldehyde concentrations, with a median indoor concentrations of 22.4 μ g/m³ (18.2 ppb) as compared to a median of 36 μ g/m³ found in the 2007 CNHS. Unlike in the CNHS study where formaldehyde concentrations were measured with pumped DNPH samplers, the formaldehyde concentrations in the HENGH study were measured with passive samplers, which were estimated to under-measure the true indoor formaldehyde concentrations by approximately 7.5%. Applying this correction to the HENGH indoor formaldehyde concentrations results in a median indoor concentration of 24.1 μ g/m³, which is 33% lower than the 36 μ g/m³ found in the 2007 CNHS.

Thus, while new homes built after the 2009 CARB formaldehyde ATCM have a 33% lower median indoor formaldehyde concentration and cancer risk, the median lifetime cancer risk is still 120 per million for homes built with CARB compliant composite wood products. This median lifetime cancer risk is more than 12 times the OEHHA 10 in a million cancer risk threshold (OEHHA, 2017a).

With respect to the Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project, Huntington Beach, CA, the buildings consist of senior living residential spaces.

The residential occupants will potentially have continuous exposure (e.g. 24 hours per day, 52 weeks per year). These exposures are anticipated to result in significant cancer risks resulting from exposures to formaldehyde released by the building materials and furnishing commonly found in residential construction.

Because these residences will be constructed with CARB Phase 2 Formaldehyde ATCM materials, and be ventilated with the minimum code required amount of outdoor air, the indoor residential formaldehyde concentrations are likely similar to those concentrations observed in residences built with CARB Phase 2 Formaldehyde ATCM materials, which is a median of 24.1 μ g/m³ (Singer et. al., 2020)

Assuming that the residential occupants inhale 20 m³ of air per day, the average 70-year lifetime formaldehyde daily dose is 482 μ g/day for continuous exposure in the residences. This exposure represents a cancer risk of 120 per million, which is more than 12 times the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million. For occupants that do not have continuous exposure for 70 years, the cancer risk will be proportionally less but still substantially over the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million (e.g. continuous 20 year occupancy, more than 3.4 times the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million).

In addition, we note that the average outdoor air concentration of formaldehyde in California is 3 ppb, or $3.7 \ \mu g/m^3$, (California Air Resources Board, 2004), and thus represents an average pre-existing background airborne cancer risk of 1.85 per million. Thus, the indoor air formaldehyde exposures describe above exacerbate this pre-existing risk resulting from outdoor air formaldehyde exposures.

Additionally, the SCAQMD's Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study ("MATES V") identifies an existing cancer risk at the Project site of 399 per million due to the site's elevated ambient air contaminant concentrations, which are due to the area's high levels of vehicle traffic. These impacts would further exacerbate the pre-existing cancer risk to the building occupants, which result from exposure to formaldehyde in both indoor and outdoor air.

Appendix A, Indoor Formaldehyde Concentrations and the CARB Formaldehyde ATCM, provides analyses that show utilization of CARB Phase 2 Formaldehyde ATCM materials will not ensure acceptable cancer risks with respect to formaldehyde emissions from composite wood products.

Even composite wood products manufactured with CARB certified ultra low emitting formaldehyde (ULEF) resins do not insure that the indoor air will have concentrations of formaldehyde the meet the OEHHA cancer risks that substantially exceed 10 per million. The permissible emission rates for ULEF composite wood products are only 11-15% lower than the CARB Phase 2 emission rates. Only use of composite wood products made with no-added formaldehyde resins (NAF), such as resins made from soy, polyvinyl acetate, or methylene diisocyanate can insure that the OEHHA cancer risk of 10 per million is met.

The following describes a method that should be used, prior to construction in the environmental review under CEQA, for determining whether the indoor concentrations resulting from the formaldehyde emissions of specific building materials/furnishings selected exceed cancer and non-cancer guidelines. Such a design analyses can be used to identify those materials/furnishings prior to the completion of the City's CEQA review and project approval, that have formaldehyde emission rates that contribute to indoor concentrations that exceed cancer and non-cancer guidelines, so that alternative lower emitting materials/furnishings may be selected and/or higher minimum outdoor air ventilation rates can be increased to achieve acceptable indoor concentrations and incorporated as mitigation measures for this project.

Pre-Construction Building Material/Furnishing Formaldehyde Emissions Assessment

This formaldehyde emissions assessment should be used in the environmental review under CEQA to <u>assess</u> the indoor formaldehyde concentrations from the proposed loading of building materials/furnishings, the area-specific formaldehyde emission rate data for building materials/furnishings, and the design minimum outdoor air ventilation rates. This assessment allows the applicant (and the City) to determine, before the conclusion of the

environmental review process and the building materials/furnishings are specified, purchased, and installed, if the total chemical emissions will exceed cancer and non-cancer guidelines, and if so, allow for changes in the selection of specific material/furnishings and/or the design minimum outdoor air ventilations rates such that cancer and non-cancer guidelines are not exceeded.

1.) <u>Define Indoor Air Quality Zones</u>. Divide the building into separate indoor air quality zones, (IAQ Zones). IAQ Zones are defined as areas of well-mixed air. Thus, each ventilation system with recirculating air is considered a single zone, and each room or group of rooms where air is not recirculated (e.g. 100% outdoor air) is considered a separate zone. For IAQ Zones with the same construction material/furnishings and design minimum outdoor air ventilation rates. (e.g. hotel rooms, apartments, condominiums, etc.) the formaldehyde emission rates need only be assessed for a single IAQ Zone of that type.

2.) <u>Calculate Material/Furnishing Loading</u>. For each IAQ Zone, determine the building material and furnishing loadings (e.g., m² of material/m² floor area, units of furnishings/m² floor area) from an inventory of <u>all</u> potential indoor formaldehyde sources, including flooring, ceiling tiles, furnishings, finishes, insulation, sealants, adhesives, and any products constructed with composite wood products containing urea-formaldehyde resins (e.g., plywood, medium density fiberboard, particleboard).

3.) <u>Calculate the Formaldehyde Emission Rate</u>. For each building material, calculate the formaldehyde emission rate (μ g/h) from the product of the area-specific formaldehyde emission rate (μ g/m²-h) and the area (m²) of material in the IAQ Zone, and from each furnishing (e.g. chairs, desks, etc.) from the unit-specific formaldehyde emission rate (μ g/unit-h) and the number of units in the IAQ Zone.

NOTE: As a result of the high-performance building rating systems and building codes (California Building Standards Commission, 2014; USGBC, 2014), most manufacturers of building materials furnishings sold in the United States conduct chemical emission rate tests using the California Department of Health "Standard Method for the Testing and Evaluation of Volatile Organic Chemical Emissions for Indoor Sources Using Environmental Chambers," (CDPH, 2017), or other equivalent chemical emission rate

testing methods. Most manufacturers of building furnishings sold in the United States conduct chemical emission rate tests using ANSI/BIFMA M7.1 Standard Test Method for Determining VOC Emissions (BIFMA, 2018), or other equivalent chemical emission rate testing methods.

CDPH, BIFMA, and other chemical emission rate testing programs, typically certify that a material or furnishing does not create indoor chemical concentrations in excess of the maximum concentrations permitted by their certification. For instance, the CDPH emission rate testing requires that the measured emission rates when input into an office, school, or residential model do not exceed one-half of the OEHHA Chronic Exposure Guidelines (OEHHA, 2017b) for the 35 specific VOCs, including formaldehyde, listed in Table 4-1 of the CDPH test method (CDPH, 2017). These certifications themselves do not provide the actual area-specific formaldehyde emission rates do not exceed the maximum rate allowed for the certification. Thus, for example, the data for a certification of a specific type of flooring may be used to calculate that the area-specific emission rate of formaldehyde is less than 31 μ g/m²-h, but not the actual measured specific emission rate, which may be 3, 18, or 30 μ g/m²-h. These area-specific emission rates determined from the product certifications of CDPH, BIFA, and other certification programs can be used as an initial estimate of the formaldehyde emission rate.

If the actual area-specific emission rates of a building material or furnishing is needed (i.e. the initial emission rates estimates from the product certifications are higher than desired), then that data can be acquired by requesting from the manufacturer the complete chemical emission rate test report. For instance if the complete CDPH emission test report is requested for a CDHP certified product, that report will provide the actual area-specific emission rates for not only the 35 specific VOCs, including formaldehyde, listed in Table 4-1 of the CDPH test method (CDPH, 2017), but also all of the cancer and reproductive/developmental chemicals listed in the California Proposition 65 Safe Harbor Levels (OEHHA, 2017a), all of the toxic air contaminants (TACs) in the California Air Resources Board Toxic Air Contamination List (CARB, 2011), and the 10 chemicals with the greatest emission rates.

Alternatively, a sample of the building material or furnishing can be submitted to a chemical emission rate testing laboratory, such as Berkeley Analytical Laboratory (<u>https://berkeleyanalytical.com</u>), to measure the formaldehyde emission rate.

4.) <u>Calculate the Total Formaldehyde Emission Rate.</u> For each IAQ Zone, calculate the total formaldehyde emission rate (i.e. μ g/h) from the individual formaldehyde emission rates from each of the building material/furnishings as determined in Step 3.

5.) <u>Calculate the Indoor Formaldehyde Concentration</u>. For each IAQ Zone, calculate the indoor formaldehyde concentration (μ g/m³) from Equation 1 by dividing the total formaldehyde emission rates (i.e. μ g/h) as determined in Step 4, by the design minimum outdoor air ventilation rate (m³/h) for the IAQ Zone.

$$C_{in} = \frac{E_{total}}{Q_{oa}}$$
 (Equation 1)

where:

 C_{in} = indoor formaldehyde concentration (µg/m³)

 $E_{total} = total$ formaldehyde emission rate (µg/h) into the IAQ Zone.

 Q_{oa} = design minimum outdoor air ventilation rate to the IAQ Zone (m³/h)

The above Equation 1 is based upon mass balance theory, and is referenced in Section 3.10.2 "Calculation of Estimated Building Concentrations" of the California Department of Health "Standard Method for the Testing and Evaluation of Volatile Organic Chemical Emissions for Indoor Sources Using Environmental Chambers", (CDPH, 2017).

6.) <u>Calculate the Indoor Exposure Cancer and Non-Cancer Health Risks</u>. For each IAQ Zone, calculate the cancer and non-cancer health risks from the indoor formaldehyde concentrations determined in Step 5 and as described in the OEHHA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines; Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments (OEHHA, 2015).

7.) <u>Mitigate Indoor Formaldehyde Exposures of exceeding the CEQA Cancer and/or Non-</u> <u>Cancer Health Risks</u>. In each IAQ Zone, provide mitigation for any formaldehyde exposure risk as determined in Step 6, that exceeds the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million or the CEQA non-cancer Hazard Quotient of 1.0.

Provide the source and/or ventilation mitigation required in all IAQ Zones to reduce the health risks of the chemical exposures below the CEQA cancer and non-cancer health risks.

Source mitigation for formaldehyde may include:

- 1.) reducing the amount materials and/or furnishings that emit formaldehyde
- 2.) substituting a different material with a lower area-specific emission rate of formaldehyde

Ventilation mitigation for formaldehyde emitted from building materials and/or furnishings may include:

1.) increasing the design minimum outdoor air ventilation rate to the IAQ Zone.

NOTE: Mitigating the formaldehyde emissions through use of less material/furnishings, or use of lower emitting materials/furnishings, is the preferred mitigation option, as mitigation with increased outdoor air ventilation increases initial and operating costs associated with the heating/cooling systems.

Further, we are not asking that the builder "speculate" on what and how much composite materials be used, but rather at the design stage to select composite wood materials based on the formaldehyde emission rates that manufacturers routinely conduct using the California Department of Health "Standard Method for the Testing and Evaluation of Volatile Organic Chemical Emissions for Indoor Sources Using Environmental Chambers," (CDPH, 2017), and use the procedure described earlier above (i.e. Pre-Construction Building Material/Furnishing Formaldehyde Emissions Assessment) to insure that the materials selected achieve acceptable cancer risks from material off gassing of formaldehyde.

Outdoor Air Ventilation Impact. Another important finding of the CNHS, was that the outdoor air ventilation rates in the homes were very low. Outdoor air ventilation is a very

important factor influencing the indoor concentrations of air contaminants, as it is the primary removal mechanism of all indoor air generated contaminants. Lower outdoor air exchange rates cause indoor generated air contaminants to accumulate to higher indoor air concentrations. Many homeowners rarely open their windows or doors for ventilation as a result of their concerns for security/safety, noise, dust, and odor concerns (Price, 2007). In the CNHS field study, 32% of the homes did not use their windows during the 24-hour Test Day, and 15% of the homes did not use their windows during the entire preceding week. Most of the homes with no window usage were homes in the winter field session. Thus, a substantial percentage of homeowners never open their windows, especially in the winter season. The median 24-hour measurement was 0.26 air changes per hour (ach), with a range of 0.09 ach to 5.3 ach. A total of 67% of the homes had outdoor air exchange rates below the minimum California Building Code (2001) requirement of 0.35 ach. Thus, the relatively tight envelope construction, combined with the fact that many people never open their windows for ventilation, results in homes with low outdoor air exchange rates and higher indoor air contaminant concentrations.

The Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project, Huntington Beach, CA is close to roads with moderate to high traffic (e.g., Bolsa Chica Street, Warner Avenue, etc.).

According to Table 4.8.A in the Draft Environmental Impact Report - Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community, Huntington Beach, CA (LSA, 2023), the existing Project ambient sound levels range from, 58.2 - 67.6 dBA CNEL. However, these ambient sound levels were measured at just 2 locations over a single 24-hr period on July 26-27, 2022. In order to design the building for this Project such that interior noise levels are acceptable, an acoustic study with actual on-site measurements of the existing ambient noise levels and modeled future ambient noise levels needs to be conducted. The acoustic study of the existing ambient noise levels should be conducted over a minimum of a one-week period and report the dBA CNEL or Ldn. This study will allow for the selection of a building envelope and windows with a sufficient STC such that the indoor noise levels are acceptable. A mechanical supply of outdoor air ventilation to allow for a habitable interior environment with closed windows and doors will also be required. Such a ventilation system would allow windows and doors to be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control exterior noise within building interiors.

<u>PM_{2.5} Outdoor Concentrations Impact</u>. An additional impact of the nearby motor vehicle traffic associated with this project, are the outdoor concentrations of PM_{2.5}. According to the Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community, Huntington Beach, CA (LSA, 2023), the Project is located in the South Coast Air Basin, which is a State and Federal non-attainment area for PM_{2.5}.

Additionally, the SCAQMD's MATES V study cites an existing cancer risk of 399 per million at the Project site due to the site's high concentration of ambient air contaminants resulting from the area's high levels of motor vehicle traffic.

An air quality analyses should be conducted to determine the concentrations of PM_{2.5} in the outdoor and indoor air that people inhale each day. This air quality analyses needs to consider the cumulative impacts of the project related emissions, existing and projected future emissions from local PM_{2.5} sources (e.g. stationary sources, motor vehicles, and airport traffic) upon the outdoor air concentrations at the Project site. If the outdoor concentrations are determined to exceed the California and National annual average PM_{2.5} exceedence concentration of 12 μ g/m³, or the National 24-hour average exceedence concentration of 35 μ g/m³, then the buildings need to have a mechanical supply of outdoor air that has air filtration with sufficient removal efficiency, such that the indoor concentrations of outdoor PM_{2.5} particles is less than the California and National PM_{2.5} annual and 24-hour standards.

It is my experience that based on the projected high traffic noise levels, the annual average concentration of $PM_{2.5}$ will exceed the California and National $PM_{2.5}$ annual and 24-hour standards and warrant installation of high efficiency air filters (i.e. at least MERV 13, or possibly MERV 14 or 15 depending on the results of the Project ambient $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations) in all mechanically supplied outdoor air ventilation systems.

Indoor Air Quality Impact Mitigation Measures

The following are recommended mitigation measures to minimize the impacts upon indoor quality:

Indoor Formaldehyde Concentrations Mitigation. Use only composite wood materials (e.g. hardwood plywood, medium density fiberboard, particleboard) for all interior finish systems that are made with CARB approved no-added formaldehyde (NAF) resins (CARB, 2009). CARB Phase 2 certified composite wood products, or ultra-low emitting formaldehyde (ULEF) resins, do not insure indoor formaldehyde concentrations that are below the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million. Only composite wood products manufactured with CARB approved no-added formaldehyde (NAF) resins, such as resins made from soy, polyvinyl acetate, or methylene diisocyanate can insure that the OEHHA cancer risk of 10 per million is met.

Alternatively, conduct the previously described Pre-Construction Building Material/Furnishing Chemical Emissions Assessment, to determine that the combination of formaldehyde emissions from building materials and furnishings do not create indoor formaldehyde concentrations that exceed the CEQA cancer and non-cancer health risks.

It is important to note that we are not asking that the builder "speculate" on what and how much composite materials be used, but rather at the design stage to select composite wood materials based on the formaldehyde emission rates that manufacturers routinely conduct using the California Department of Health "Standard Method for the Testing and Evaluation of Volatile Organic Chemical Emissions for Indoor Sources Using Environmental Chambers", (CDPH, 2017), and use the procedure described above (i.e. Pre-Construction Building Material/Furnishing Formaldehyde Emissions Assessment) to insure that the materials selected achieve acceptable cancer risks from material off gassing of formaldehyde.

<u>Outdoor Air Ventilation Mitigation</u>. Provide <u>each</u> habitable room with a continuous mechanical supply of outdoor air that meets or exceeds the California 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (California Energy Commission, 2015) requirements of the greater of 15 cfm/occupant or 0.15 cfm/ft² of floor area. Following installation of the system conduct

testing and balancing to insure that required amount of outdoor air is entering each habitable room and provide a written report documenting the outdoor airflow rates. Do not use exhaust only mechanical outdoor air systems, use only balanced outdoor air supply and exhaust systems or outdoor air supply only systems. Provide a manual for the occupants or maintenance personnel, that describes the purpose of the mechanical outdoor air system and the operation and maintenance requirements of the system.

 $PM_{2.5}$ Outdoor Air Concentration Mitigation. Install air filtration with sufficient $PM_{2.5}$ removal efficiency (e.g. MERV 13 or higher) to filter the outdoor air entering the mechanical outdoor air supply systems, such that the indoor concentrations of outdoor $PM_{2.5}$ particles are less than the California and National $PM_{2.5}$ annual and 24-hour standards. Install the air filters in the system such that they are accessible for replacement by the occupants or maintenance personnel. Include in the mechanical outdoor air ventilation system manual instructions on how to replace the air filters and the estimated frequency of replacement.

References

BIFA. 2018. BIFMA Product Safety and Performance Standards and Guidelines. www.bifma.org/page/standardsoverview

California Air Resources Board. 2004. Formaldehyde in the Home. https://ww3.arb.ca.gov > research > indoor > formaldgl08-04.pdf

California Air Resources Board. 2009. Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Reduce Formaldehyde Emissions from Composite Wood Products. California Environmental Protection Agency, Sacramento, CA. <u>https://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2007/compwood07/fro-final.pdf</u>

California Air Resources Board. 2011. Toxic Air Contaminant Identification List. California Environmental Protection Agency, Sacramento, CA. <u>https://www.arb.ca.gov/toxics/id/taclist.htm</u> California Building Code. 2001. California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2 Volume 1, Appendix Chapter 12, Interior Environment, Division 1, Ventilation, Section 1207: 2001 California Building Code, California Building Standards Commission. Sacramento, CA.

California Building Standards Commission (2014). 2013 California Green Building Standards Code. California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11. California Building Standards Commission, Sacramento, CA <u>http://www.bsc.ca.gov/Home/CALGreen.aspx.</u>

California Energy Commission, PIER Program. CEC-500-2007-033. Final Report, ARB Contract 03-326. Available at: www.arb.ca.gov/research/apr/past/03-326.pdf.

California Energy Commission, 2015. 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6. http://www.energy.ca.gov/2015publications/CEC-400-2015-037/CEC-400-2015-037-CMF.pdf

CDPH. 2017. Standard Method for the Testing and Evaluation of Volatile Organic Chemical Emissions for Indoor Sources Using Environmental Chambers, Version 1.1. California Department of Public Health, Richmond, CA. https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/ DEODC/EHLB/IAQ/Pages/VOC.aspx. Environmental Impact Report. SCH No. 2018011001.

EPA. 2011. Exposure Factors Handbook: 2011 Edition, Chapter 16 – Activity Factors. Report EPA/600/R-09/052F, September 2011. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

LSA, 2023. Draft Environmental Impact Report - Bolsa Chica Senior Living Community Project, Huntington Beach, CA.

OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines; Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments.

OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). 2017a. Proposition 65 Safe Harbor Levels. No Significant Risk Levels for Carcinogens and Maximum Allowable Dose Levels for Chemicals Causing Reproductive Toxicity. Available at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/pdf/safeharbor081513.pdf

OEHHA - Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2017b. All OEHHA Acute, 8-hour and Chronic Reference Exposure Levels. Available at: http://oehha.ca.gov/air/allrels.html

Offermann, F. J. 2009. Ventilation and Indoor Air Quality in New Homes. California Air Resources Board and California Energy Commission, PIER Energy-Related Environmental Research Program. Collaborative Report. CEC-500-2009-085. <u>https://www.arb.ca.gov/research/apr/past/04-310.pdf</u>

Offermann, F. J. and A. T. Hodgson. 2011. Emission Rates of Volatile Organic Compounds in New Homes. Proceedings Indoor Air 2011 (12th International Conference on Indoor Air Quality and Climate 2011), June 5-10, 2011, Austin, TX.

Singer, B.C, Chan, W.R, Kim, Y., Offermann, F.J., and Walker I.S. 2020. Indoor Air Quality in California Homes with Code-Required Mechanical Ventilation. Indoor Air, Vol 30, Issue 5, 885-899.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2015. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Handbook. South Coast Air Quality Management District, Diamond Bar, CA, <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook</u>

USGBC. 2014. LEED BD+C Homes v4. U.S. Green Building Council, Washington, D.C. <u>http://www.usgbc.org/credits/homes/v4</u>

APPENDIX A

INDOOR FORMALDEHYDE CONCENTRATIONS AND THE CARB FORMALDEHYDE ATCM

With respect to formaldehyde emissions from composite wood products, the CARB ATCM regulations of formaldehyde emissions from composite wood products, do not assure healthful indoor air quality. The following is the stated purpose of the CARB ATCM regulation - *The purpose of this airborne toxic control measure is to "reduce formaldehyde emissions from composite wood products, and finished goods that contain composite wood products, that are sold, offered for sale, supplied, used, or manufactured for sale in California"*. In other words, the CARB ATCM regulations do not "assure healthful indoor air quality", but rather "reduce formaldehyde emissions from composite words, the CARB ATCM regulations do not "assure healthful indoor air quality", but rather "reduce formaldehyde emissions from composite wood products".

Just how much protection do the CARB ATCM regulations provide building occupants from the formaldehyde emissions generated by composite wood products? Definitely some, but certainly the regulations do not "*assure healthful indoor air quality*" when CARB Phase 2 products are utilized. As shown in the Chan 2019 study of new California homes, the median indoor formaldehyde concentration was of 22.4 μ g/m³ (18.2 ppb), which corresponds to a cancer risk of 112 per million for occupants with continuous exposure, which is more than 11 times the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million.

Another way of looking at how much protection the CARB ATCM regulations provide building occupants from the formaldehyde emissions generated by composite wood products is to calculate the maximum number of square feet of composite wood product that can be in a residence without exceeding the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million for occupants with continuous occupancy.

For this calculation I utilized the floor area (2,272 ft²), the ceiling height (8.5 ft), and the number of bedrooms (4) as defined in Appendix B (New Single-Family Residence Scenario) of the Standard Method for the Testing and Evaluation of Volatile Organic Chemical Emissions for Indoor Sources Using Environmental Chambers, Version 1.1, 2017, California Department of Public Health,

Richmond, CA. DEODC/EHLB/IAQ/Pages/VOC.aspx.

For the outdoor air ventilation rate I used the 2019 Title 24 code required mechanical ventilation rate (ASHRAE 62.2) of 106 cfm (180 m³/h) calculated for this model residence. For the composite wood formaldehyde emission rates I used the CARB ATCM Phase 2 rates.

The calculated maximum number of square feet of composite wood product that can be in a residence, without exceeding the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million for occupants with continuous occupancy are as follows for the different types of regulated composite wood products.

Medium Density Fiberboard (MDF) – 15 ft² (0.7% of the floor area), or Particle Board – 30 ft² (1.3% of the floor area), or Hardwood Plywood – 54 ft² (2.4% of the floor area), or Thin MDF – 46 ft² (2.0% of the floor area).

For offices and hotels the calculated maximum amount of composite wood product (% of floor area) that can be used without exceeding the CEQA cancer risk of 10 per million for occupants, assuming 8 hours/day occupancy, and the California Mechanical Code minimum outdoor air ventilation rates are as follows for the different types of regulated composite wood products.

Medium Density Fiberboard (MDF) -3.6 % (offices) and 4.6% (hotel rooms), or Particle Board -7.2 % (offices) and 9.4% (hotel rooms), or Hardwood Plywood -13 % (offices) and 17% (hotel rooms), or Thin MDF -11 % (offices) and 14 % (hotel rooms)

Clearly the CARB ATCM does not regulate the formaldehyde emissions from composite wood products such that the potentially large areas of these products, such as for flooring, baseboards, interior doors, window and door trims, and kitchen and bathroom cabinetry, could be used without causing indoor formaldehyde concentrations that result in CEQA

17 of 18

cancer risks that substantially exceed 10 per million for occupants with continuous occupancy.

Even composite wood products manufactured with CARB certified ultra low emitting formaldehyde (ULEF) resins do not insure that the indoor air will have concentrations of formaldehyde the meet the OEHHA cancer risks that substantially exceed 10 per million. The permissible emission rates for ULEF composite wood products are only 11-15% lower than the CARB Phase 2 emission rates. Only use of composite wood products made with no-added formaldehyde resins (NAF), such as resins made from soy, polyvinyl acetate, or methylene diisocyanate can insure that the OEHHA cancer risk of 10 per million is met.

If CARB Phase 2 compliant or ULEF composite wood products are utilized in construction, then the resulting indoor formaldehyde concentrations should be determined in the design phase using the specific amounts of each type of composite wood product, the specific formaldehyde emission rates, and the volume and outdoor air ventilation rates of the indoor spaces, and all feasible mitigation measures employed to reduce this impact (e.g. use less formaldehyde containing composite wood products and/or incorporate mechanical systems capable of higher outdoor air ventilation rates). See the procedure described earlier (i.e. Pre-Construction Building Material/Furnishing Formaldehyde Emissions Assessment) to insure that the materials selected achieve acceptable cancer risks from material off gassing of formaldehyde.

Alternatively, and perhaps a simpler approach, is to use only composite wood products (e.g. hardwood plywood, medium density fiberboard, particleboard) for all interior finish systems that are made with CARB approved no-added formaldehyde (NAF) resins.

9/25/2018



Home

Company Profile

Healthy Building Services

Diagnostic Services

Laboratory Services

Workshops & Seminars

Expert Witness Services

Resources

News & Events

Employment

Contact Us

Expert Witness Services

Francis (Bud) J. Offermann PE CIH

President: Indoor Environmental Engineering, San Francisco, CA. December, 1981 - present. e-mail: offermann@iee-sf.com

Education

- M.S. Mechanical Engineering Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Graduate Studies in Air Pollution Monitoring and Control University of
- California, Berkeley, CA.
- B.S. in Mechanical Engineering Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.

Professional Affiliations

ACGIH, AIHA, ASHRAE, CSI, ASTM, ISIAQ, PARMA, and USGBC

Work Experience

Mr. Offermann PE, CIH, has 36 years experience as an IAQ researcher, technical author, and workshop instructor. He is president of Indoor Environmental Engineering, a San Francisco based IAQ R&D consulting firm. As president of Indoor Environmental Engineering, Mr. Offermann directs an interdisciplinary team of environmental scientists, chemists, and mechanical engineers in indoor air quality building investigations. Under Mr. Offermann's supervision, IEE has developed both pro-active and reactive IAQ measurement methods and diagnostic protocols. He has supervised over 2,000 IAQ investigations in commercial, residential, and institutional buildings and conducted numerous forensic investigations related to IAQ.

Litigation Experience

Mr. Offermann has been qualified numerous times in court as an expert in the field of indoor air quality and ventilation for both plaintiffs and defendants. He has been deposed over 150 times in cases involving indoor air quality/ventilation issues in commercial, residential, and institutional buildings involving construction defects, and/or operation and maintenance problems. Examples of indoor air quality cases he has worked on are alleged personal injury and/or property damages from mold and bacterial contamination/moisture intrusion, building renovation activities, insufficient outdoor air ventilation, off gassing of volatile organic compounds from building materials and coatings, malfunctioning gas heaters and carbon monoxide poisoning, and applications of pesticides. Mr. Offermann has testified with respect to the scientific admissability of expert testimony regarding indoor air quality issues via Daubert and Kelly-Frye motions.

Copyright 2006 Indoor Environmental Engineering. Site design by Tierra Technology.

CLICKY ANALYTICS CLICKY ANALYTICS



View Curriculum Vitae (PDF)