

Comment 1 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: CARB Board Governance / PFAS / Falsehoods

Comment:

To the CARB board members,
CARB states in the Initial Statement of Reasons for the ATCM (ISOR, Page 8, second paragraph of 2. Environmental Impacts and Benefits), and I quote,
“An additional co-benefit of the proposed phase out is the elimination of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS/PFOS) contained in the fume suppressants used in chrome plating operations.”

The quoted statement contains the following falsehoods.

False Statement 1 - “...contained in the fume suppressants used in chrome plating...”. The reason this is false is because according to the CARB website here <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/fume-suppressant-information>, the use of PFAS/PFOS fume suppressants has been banned in California since 2016. CARB maintains a list of approved and unapproved fume suppressants here <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/chrome-plating-approved-fume-suppressant-list>.

You can verify that the footnotes show the PFAS/PFOS fume suppressants are not allowed.

False Statement 2 - “An additional co-benefit of the proposed phase out is the elimination of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)...”. The reason this is false is that a benefit can only exist when change occurs as a result. In this case, there is no change. Fume Suppressants are not being used by California chrome platers. So, no co-benefit is achieved by eliminating something already eliminated.

I provided this comment to the staff previously in one of the recorded working meetings. I am disappointed that it remains in the documents that are now being presented to the Board for decision. The inclusion of PFAS/PFOS as a co-benefit is a dog whistle that un-necessarily attracts attention to this rule-making and increases pressure upon the board to make decisions which are not based on current facts and data. If the board truly believes that PFAS/PFOS are still being used by chrome platers in California then it is an enforcement failure which would shine the light directly upon the CARB.

As an individual decision maker on the CARB board, you should ask yourself these questions.

- 1) Why is staff adding this element to the decision I am being asked to make?
- 2) Are the other benefits of the

proposed ATCM so weak that these falsehoods and this appeal to emotion were necessary?

3) Does CARB staff respect the independent decision-making authority of the board or is the board a rubber stamp?

Thank you for your service on the CARB board.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-02 09:47:30

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Hunaid

Last Name: Nulwala

Email Address: Nulwala@lumishieldtech.com

Affiliation: Lumishield technologies

Subject: Please ban Chrome and chromating

Comment:

Unless regulations don't take a charge we will never be able to grow sustainable solutions.

There are solutions which replace Hex chrome.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-02 17:14:49

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: JIM

Last Name: MEYER

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: CORRECTION and APOLOGY to the Board

Comment:

I have been informed by a knowleddgeable party that the premise of my comment made on 12-2-2022 was incorrect. There are some hex chrome plating firms that do use PFAS fume suppressants. They do that because PFOS was banned but not PFAS. Some platers do use PFAS fume suppressants; purportedly because their air permits require it.

So, I apologize to the CARB board for my ignorant statement.

Our facility does not use PFAS or PFOS and never has. That would seem to make us a potential asset to the State of California - A hex chrome plater, with HEPA controls and no PFAS/PFOS dependency or liability and with a mission to support the national aviation infrastructure and the national defense. Yet, the ATCM bans us.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-05 13:42:28

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: AB 617 Community Emissions Reduction Plan

Comment:

Attention CARB board members.

South Coast AQMD and leaders in this community spent many months, days, and hours to create a Community Emissions Reduction Plan under AB 617. Please have your staff take a look at it. It is for the Wilmington, Carson, West Long Beach Community which CARB consistently uses as a poster child for disadvantage relative to the environment. The Cal Enviro Score in West Long Beach near Cabrillo High School is in the 96th percentile.

Here is the final CERP published in 2019.

<https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ab-617-ab-134/steering-committees/wilmington/cerp/final-cerp-wcwlb.pdf?sfvrsn=8>

On page 3a-9, the chart shows the total cancer risk in our area by cause. It shows that cancer risk from diesel is more than 1000 in a million but that cancer risk from ALL OTHER

SOURCES COMBINED (INCLUDING HEX CHROME) is less than 240 per million. So, why does CARB, in the ISOR document take pains to point out that hex chrome is 500 times more cancer potent than diesel? That is a very misleading way to present potency information. The AQMD method of presentation is much more honest. CARB staff should be ashamed of that. Why bring up diesel in the hex chrome ISOR document at all? Your staff knows these numbers and this data but has consciously chosen to present it in the most fear provoking way possible. Is diesel so prevalent that we measure and express cancer risks relative to diesel in ATCMs so people can understand? Has diesel pollution become the standard to which other risks are compared? Pretty pathetic approach to science and to communication of real risk if you ask me. It is certainly not representative of an organization purporting to be the World Standard in air pollution control.

An astute reader will go on to note that the same cancer risk chart on page 3a-9 shows the relationship between diesel and other air toxics IN THE ENTIRE SOUTH COAST BASIN which is home to 86 of the 113 hex chrome facilities in this ATCM. This isn't just an isolated area this is the vast majority of what your decision will impact with the ATCM. The data shows diesel FAR outweighs hex chrome in terms of cancer risk to the entire South Coast community.

But let's talk about hex chrome a little bit more.

Look at Page 3b-1 of the CERP. I am intrigued by the information in the box that states hexavalent chromium is a key air toxic in this

community and that the cause is MOSTLY FROM BRAKE WEAR... yet we should BAN chrome platers.

If you ban chrome platers the employees who live here will become unemployed, how does that help them or the people in this community?

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-06 16:20:07

No Duplicates.

Comment 5 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Rich

Last Name: Roberson

Email Address: richroberson@outlook.com

Affiliation:

Subject: A Process Comparison: Hexavalent vs. Trivalent Hard Chrome

Comment:

Hexavalent Cr

Trivalent Cr

Excellent deposit properties

Struggles with many issues

Simple bath chemistry

Very complicated bath formulation

Very good corrosion resistance

Requires a nickel deposit first

Fewer tanks & less floorspace

Much larger plating lines

Reverse etch activation

Needs an alkaline cleaner and acid dip

Broad operating window

Sensitive to operating conditions

Easy to control & maintain

Daily analysis & additions needed

Tolerant to bath impurities

Very sensitive to many impurities

Uses standard lead anodes

Expensive MMO anodes required

Tolerates water additions

Sensitive to water concentration

Bath additions not a problem

Requires 'Bleed and Feed'

Indefinite bath life

Periodic bath dumps required

Easily Zero Discharged

Waste treatment always needed

Over 100 years of success

New and unproven

Much lower investment

Considerable higher entry cost

Inexpensive to operate

Significantly higher operating costs

Many possible vendors

Tied to a single supplier

Easily made Sustainable

Considerable waste generator

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-06 16:41:34

No Duplicates.

Comment 6 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Art

Last Name: Holman

Email Address: art@shermplating.com

Affiliation: Sherm's Plating

Subject: Public Comment

Comment:

"Please add the two attachments to the public comment section for Chrome ATCM."

Comment uploaded by CARB Staff on behalf of Art Holman

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/11-chromeatcm2023-VDUCdlMmAw8GaARr.pdf>'

Original File Name: Art Holman.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-12 18:08:50

No Duplicates.

Comment 7 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Eric

Last Name: Soiland

Email Address: esoiland@sonic.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Chrome Metal Finishing

Comment:

CARB has targeted a small industry to move the pressure off the State. Business will be forced to close, thousands of jobs will be lost, supply chains and consumers will have to find sources outside of the State of California. Other States that do not have the regulations and controls that California shops have in place.

The three finishes of Decorative, Functional Chrome Metal Finishing and Chromic Acid Anodizing represent less than 1% of total ChromeVI Emissions for the entire State of California.

When an entire industry is gone and CARB still has 99% Hex Chrome in air emissions who will be targeted next? Banning Chrome in the State does not make the demand go away; it only creates more pollution from mobile emission sources such as trucks and cars. Why ban Hex Chrome in a State that has it under control?

Fun
Fact: Based on the reported annual emissions CARB provided (2018-2019) all of the decorative chrome platers in the state emitted less hexavalent chromium at .00856 lbs per year less than the popular theme park resort in Anaheim at 0.106 lbs per year.

CARB should base the rule on real science and data, not emotions.

Please do NOT shut down our local chrome shops…there has to be a better way

Regards,

Eric Soiland
2211 Spyglass Drive
Brentwood, CA 94513

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-12 17:53:04

No Duplicates.

Comment 8 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Scott

Last Name: Babcock

Email Address: sdwbabcock@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: plating

Comment:

Hello,

I work as

an engraver with many California platers who are restoring
brightwork on vintage cars, usually in preparation for major shows
such as the Concours d'Elegance in Pebble Beach.

It would

sadden me greatly to know that all of the high-quality chrome work
that currently goes on in our state would be prohibited, in an
effort to mitigate a very small percentage (less than one percent I
understand) of the Chrome VI emissions currently being emitted
statewide.

I am also

an environmental advocate, and recognize the need to control
pollution of all kinds. However, this proposal seems out of balance
with regards to the benefit/cost ratio. So many businesses will
have to close, and people like me will also be discouraged from
doing business in California.

I do

believe there are less Draconian ways of controlling emissions that
would benefit a majority of the state's residents and businesses,
and not just be a bullet point on a political agenda. Let's not
make the plating industry be the fall guy!

Thanks

for listening.

Best,

Scott Babcock

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-12 22:03:06

No Duplicates.

Comment 9 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Rodger

Last Name: Lee

Email Address: iskhotrods@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: HEx Chrome

Comment:

my name is Rodger Lee and I have used Sherm's Chrome plating for 20 Years and a hand full of other chrome shops in Ca. I have been in business here in CA for 20 years building these very high end custom cars and I currently employee 18 people. We build very high end automobiles for clients all over the country. The chrome work that Sherm's custom Chrome plating is my go to source for quality chrome work. From where I sit there are 2 other Chrome shops in the country that do the work these guys do. One is in Ohio and another in Tennessee. If you outlaw the hexavalent chrome I would be forced to send our work to another state or risk being not competitive with other builders who send there chrome work to other chrome shops outside of CA. Plus the lead time currently for this level of work in 12-16 weeks any where you go and the lead time would get even longer if there was only two vendors and not 3. If all my work is going to be shipped across the country what is the real gain in your proposed legislation. Does the pollution not travel across state lines? Plus the huge expense for some thing I usually hand deliver from Bakersfield to avoid UPS damaging priceless parts.

I have no idea the pollution issues with both Chromes, but what if its all outlawed in the US its just going to be done over seas or across the border. The need for top quality Chrome happens from the craftsmen level prep and the use of quality plating supplies.

Forcing us to go to another or across the border is not a big help for all parties involved.

I can tell the difference from HEX an TRI. Its not nearly as good and If I tried to pass off the lesser quality to my customers they would know. The depth, clarity and color are all different.

If you have anymore further questions or concerns please feel free to follow up. I'm sure there is some solution to allowing Sherms and other high end platers follow stricter guidelines without forcing more people to flee CA.

The transportation segment is nearly a 100 times bigger issue than the decorative chrome platers.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-13 05:56:07

No Duplicates.

Comment 10 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Moore

Email Address: Chris@ironworksspeedandkustom.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Chrome

Comment:

My name is Christopher Moore. I am a manager at a high end custom car shop that has been using chrome plating for 20 years. We build very high-end automobiles for clients all over the United States. The hexavalent chrome work that Sherm's Custom Chrome Plating does is some of the best in the country. They are our "go to" source for quality chrome work.

In our opinion there are 2 other Chrome shops in the country that put out the quality these guys put out. One is in Ohio and another in Tennessee. If you make it illegal to use hexavalent chrome in CA we will be forced to send our work to another state.

If all of California's chrome plating is going to be shipped across the country what is the real gain in your proposed legislation? If this legislation is passed you are now causing more pollution. You are doing this because the chrome plating is not going to just stop. It will continue but it will have to be shipped out of CA and then back to CA. Do you think that pollution will not cross state lines? Forcing us to go across the border is not a big help for all parties involved. It will just continue to raise the prices in this time of inflation.

We can tell the difference from hexavalent and TRI. TRI is not even close to the quality of hexavalent chrome. If we were to try to pass off the lesser quality to our clients they would see the difference and would leave our shop for shops in other states. Please do not force more people to flee CA. I believe California can be one of the best states in the union; we just need to stop hampering capitalism. Please shut down this proposed legislation.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-13 05:59:35

No Duplicates.

Comment 11 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: William

Last Name: Ganahl

Email Address: southcityrodandcustom@gmail.com

Affiliation: South City Rod and Custom

Subject: Chromium Plating Ban in California

Comment:

To
whom it may concern,

I own a small business here in California restoring classic cars. I restore and customize cars from the 1920's through the 1960's, all of which have many chrome pieces. We restore these cars to an extremely high level, and they have been shown around the country, and some around the world. We compete for awards, which is a big part of our business, and the finish and texture of the chrome on these cars is a detrimental component of our ability to compete at a high level. I know that there are many shops here in California (the epicenter of custom and classic car culture) that share the same experience and produce the same level of quality as we do. We absolutely cannot use any other method or quality of chrome plating than hexavalent chromium to complement the quality of our builds.

I understand that if Hex Chrome is banned in CA, we could potentially send our parts out of state to be chromed. First, we currently do not ship any parts to chrome; we personally deliver all parts so as not to damage or lose any of these valuable pieces. Many of the parts are hand-made from scratch and have countless hours into their fabrication and manufacture. And many of the parts are very rare, very valuable original pieces that cannot be duplicated or replaced. For this reason, we cannot take the risk of shipping parts and having them damaged or lost. And second, it is typically California's intention to set precedent by example; if other states follow suit and hex chrome is banned in America for good, it would seriously affect the entire industry of classic and custom car building and restoration. This could mean job losses in both the chrome industry AND the classic and custom car industry, which I think you will find is a very large industry (just look at the number of car events and TV shows currently).

All of this said, the amount of pollution caused by the hex chrome process is minuscule compared to the large-scale production of mass-produced commodities. We are building one to three cars per year, which means our collective use of the chrome process is very small. It is an essential part of these builds, yet a

very small portion of the overall output of chrome shops in general. But there are chrome shops that specialize in our specific, very high standard requirements, and they would be devastated by this ban. They are all upstanding businesses (the ones we deal with) that already comply with state and federal laws, and some of which would already comply with proposed laws, as they want to stay ahead of the curve and curtail pollution and emissions.

Please consider amending your proposed legislation to allow for concessions for my industry. If this might mean allowing small production numbers, while banning production over a certain limit, I am positive that the businesses in my industry would fall well below any threshold of significant pollution. Car culture, while not appreciated by everyone, is an integral and important element of Californian and American popular culture. It is part of our history that we are trying to maintain and carry on, and it represents a huge industry that affects multitudes of businesses that contribute to the craft.

Thank you
for your consideration,

Bill
Ganahl

--

South City Rod & Custom
22432
Thunderbird Place
Hayward, CA
94545
(510)
783-6300

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-13 09:18:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 12 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: CARB and EJ - Where did Science go?

Comment:

In the past, we have been able to depend on the California air regulators for taking science based, data driven approaches to solve problems. This ATCM proposal is evidence that science and data are trumped by politics.

According to the SCAQMD MATES V study, there are over 300 pounds of hex chrome emitted annually in the region. Note, that is only in the South Coast area, not the entire state. Let's call it 500 pounds in the state.

According to the CARB ISOR, SRIA, and Appendix B of this ATCM, the amount of PERMITTED Hex Chromium emissions by chrome platers in THE ENTIRE STATE is 10.19 pounds.

According to the CARB Appendix B of this ATCM, the ACTUAL Hex Chromium Emissions by chrome platers in the ENTIRE STATE are 0.901 pounds.

So, this proposed rule bans decorative platers in the short term, and functional platers in the long term to save less than 0.2% of the hexavalent chromium emissions in the state. That is one pound out of 500.

CARB presents the purpose for the rule change as being necessary to achieve environmental justice goals. (See the purpose section of the ISOR pages 1 to 5). But, based on data, this doesn't even seem to be valid. You can see for yourself if you take the time to read the AB 617 process Community Emissions Reduction Plans from the following environmental justice communities: 1) Wilmington, Carson, and West Long Beach; 2) San Bernardino / Muscoy; 3) East LA, Boyle Heights; 4) East Coachella; 5) South LA; and 6) Southeast LA. All of those community generated plans (with one exception) appropriately recognize that chrome plating firms are not an area of concern. So, who is CARB listening to?

Why would CARB move to implement a STATEWIDE ban based on what might be an issue in one EJ community? Keeping in mind that metal working is a major job engine for California, is this how social justice is supposed to work. Do jobs count for anything?

It seems to me that the whole point of the EJ movement is to be responsive to people in their communities. So, to do that, the state (CARB) should not implement statewide edicts that impact communities other than the ones where problems may exist. Otherwise, they create more problems than they solve! Things just get worse in more communities.

It is a fact that stainless steel contains

chromium. According to CARB and AQMD and science, the heating, forging, grinding, milling, melting, welding, and cutting of stainless steel releases hexavalent chromium. It isn't just chrome plating. So, is this rule-making a shot across the bow to the entire metal working industry in California? Should we all just leave now? After all, the metal finishers were told repeatedly that since there is no "safe" level for hexavalent chromium it was necessary for CARB staff to propose this complete ban based on California health and safety laws. They say they have no choice. If that is the case, then machinists, welders, recyclers, fabricators, heat-treaters and all other metal workers will soon join the chrome platers in the unemployment line.

According to the American Cancer Society, hexavalent chrome causes cancer. Somehow, the California Health and Safety Code and therefore CARB bans it.

But, also according to the American Cancer Society, alcoholic beverages (wine) cause cancer. California markets it to the world and our governor owns a wine business. I call bullstuff on the lie that CARB is forced to impose a ban.

There are serious problems at CARB. They are being pulled away from data and science. It is hurting the state. High-paying, middle-class jobs are leaving. As CARB focuses on satisfying squeaky wheels it loses credibility on this and other important work. The job of a regulator is to adopt thoughtful rules, a ban is not thoughtful. CARB should adopt an emissions based approach.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-13 12:22:57

No Duplicates.

Comment 13 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Bryan

Last Name: Leiker

Email Address: bleiker@klanodizing.com

Affiliation: MFASC-MFANC-NASF

Subject: MFASC-MFANC-NASF Previous Comments Compilation 12-13-22

Comment:

The Metal Finishing Association of Southern California, the Metal Finishing Association of Northern California, and the National Association for Surface Finishing submit the attached comments that the associations previously submitted on June 4, 2021, June 7, 2021, June 9, 2021, February 3, 2022, May 11, 2022, and July 19, 2022. We reaffirm and reiterate each of the comments in these communications.

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/19-chromeatcm2023-VThcPARaBzcAZwR2.pdf>'

Original File Name: MF CARB CrVI ATCM Prior Comments Compilation 12-13-22.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-13 13:03:15

No Duplicates.

Comment 14 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jason
Last Name: Wenig
Email Address: jpw@thecreativeworkshop.com
Affiliation: Owner/President - The Creative Workshop

Subject: Comments regarding the Hexavalent Chromium Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM)

Comment:

To whom it may concern:

My name is Jason Wenig and I am the owner of The Creative Workshop. The Creative Workshop is a nationally recognized, highly specialized car workshop business – noted for the forensic restoration of rare, exotic and unique, historically significant automobiles.

I am

writing this letter as a representative of a billion dollar industry that works hand and hand with the decorative chrome industry – an integral and critical part of the highly specialized work we conduct.

Specifically, it seems California is looking to ban all use of Hexavalent Chrome. The subject of this initiative through CARB is “Hexavalent Chromium Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM)

for Chrome Plating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations”.

I have

been deeply involved in the automotive world for over two decades and have worked with countless suppliers, craftsmen and supporting industries. My company was named a “Top 20 Restoration Company” in the country in 2018 by one of the industry’s leading publications and I was awarded “Master Craftsmen of the year” in 2019 by the America’s Automotive Trust. My biography is attached for further reference.

The

vehicles entrusted to my company are some of the rarest and most valuable in the world, and require a diverse set of skills and supporting infrastructure to work on them. Akin to rare artwork or historic building restoration, the vehicles we work on are meticulously and authentically rebuilt – using historical archives, original factory drawings and documents and numerous other, sometimes rather arcane methods. In addition, the materials, supplies and technology utilized to restore and maintain these historic artifacts are equally obscure.

Vintage

cars touch all walks of life – and have become something much more than a niche hobby. To further reinforce this reality and the nature of these vehicles, we work with the Historic Vehicle Association, which is working in collaboration with the U.S.

Department of the Interior in developing a National Historic Vehicle Register to carefully and accurately document and recognize America's most historically significant automobiles, motorcycles, trucks and commercial vehicles. This project is the first of its type to create a permanent archive of significant historic automobiles within the Library of Congress.

As you

can imagine, working with historically significant vehicles – and in turn, our collective history – details matter. As historians entrusted with this responsibility, when considering these details, "close enough" is not good enough. There is "correct" and "incorrect", "right" and "wrong". We work incredibly hard to ensure that restorative work is done correctly and right. Along these lines, the coatings used throughout the history of the automobile is very much a part of our responsibility to get right, and quite simply put – there is no substitute for proper, Hexavalent Chrome. Historians, collectors, aficionados, curators – we all know the difference between "proper decorative chrome" vs alternatives. Alternatives cannot be used and should not be used on these incredibly valuable and coveted assets.

Said

another way, house paint would not be used to restore a Picasso just as plywood would not be used to restore a Tall Ship. To the untrained or uneducated eye, paint is paint and wood is wood – but for the integrity of our history, there is obviously a rather large difference when it comes to "correct" and "right".

How we

protect our history comes down to the front lines of the craftsmen that are entrusted to restore and maintain it – and the "tool kit" we have available to us, simply cannot be diminished.

What

further complicates this situation is that the number of businesses dedicated to automotive decorative chrome continues to shrink – with a troubling few businesses left that are capable of doing this kind of work. The few that do remain, simply must be protected – we can't afford to lose any more plating companies – wherever they may be located. For instance, we work with Sherm's Custom Plating in Sacramento, California (www.shermsplating.com). It

took us years to find them. We performed tests with numerous companies located around the country, and only Sherm's had the skills, capabilities and understanding of how to deliver correct, authentic chrome for historic cars.

An

outright ban on this industry in California will cause irreparable repercussions that will ripple throughout the industry – not just for the plating companies located in California, but to and through all of the companies that rely on their services to "get the job done right" across the Country.

Massive

events around the world celebrate the automobile – including the most prestigious car event in the world – the Pebble Beach Concours d'Elegance located in Monterey, California. Cars invited to and displayed at Pebble, set the standard for the history books. The wealthiest individuals in the world attend, and the most valuable vehicles in the world are on display. Hundreds of millions of dollars of automotive history are on display every August – and simply put, chrome alternatives would never be

accepted during the judging process – whereby the best and correctly restored vehicles are awarded. This reality would repeat itself at events the world over.

What’s interesting and salient is that the volume of materials and supplies used for this critical work is small compared to its importance, and pales in comparison to the volumes used in general industry, where chrome alternatives could readily be accepted. Penalizing small boutique businesses (and the low volume of supplies they use) to solve a problem that is fundamentally not caused by this group – that is already tightly regulated – is both near-sighted and counter-intuitive. The benefit to result ratio is completely off by targeting the decorative or even specifically, the automotive show chrome industry.

The

decorative chrome industry, as well as other supporting disciplines to the automotive world, are used to operating under regulations and controls – including proper hazardous waste disposal, limitations on volume, specialty filtration and particulate control, etc. We understand this is done so a partnership between business and protecting our environment can establish itself. This balance and partnership is in place and evolves as necessary. An all out ban, of the entire industry in California – combining low-volume automotive businesses along with larger commercial or industrial platers, again, seems counter-intuitive.

For the

record, I am particularly sensitive to this subject matter and debate. I am originally from New York, where my Father, the late Dr. Jeffrey Wenig, was director of Environmental Protection during the 1970’s. I grew up with the environment and our care of it, as an integral part of our lives. I take these matters very seriously and I am not writing this letter and voicing my opinion arbitrarily. I am hoping that healthy debate and logical terms can be established for the benefit of all parties involved.

All

said, I implore you to understand the true nature of our industry and its reliance on a small portion of the Hexavalent Chrome that we use – and to engage with the vested community, so that we can continue forward in collaboration and partnership – considering all implications to our industry, our history, jobs and of course the environment.

I am

available to provide any additional information or discuss in any way to help further this process along.

Thank

you,

Jason Wenig

Owner and

President

The Creative

Workshop

118 Hill Street

Dania Beach, FL 33004

954-920-3303

jpw@TheCreativeWorkshop.com

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/20-chromeatcm2023-WzoHdVAYBDpRCFR5.docx>'

Original File Name: ATCM - Concerns.docx

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-13 16:41:17

No Duplicates.

Comment 15 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: SRIA analysis is flawed and does not agree with CARB data

Comment:

I submitted the text below addressed to the CARB Board, CARB Staff, and the California Department of Finance on June 26, 2022. In the email, I refer to actual emissions of 2.2 pounds which is the amount of actual emissions referenced in the SRIA. However, the latest CARB document (Appendix B) on this website now shows that actual emissions are 0.9 pounds annually. CARB's numbers don't match. Hmm. Actual emissions have dropped by more than half since June? I guess this just weakens CARB's case all the more. An analysis based on actual experience would show even less emission reduction. Is this SRIA even a viable document anymore? At what point in this regulatory process does the State stop the presses to validate the basic data from which economic assessments are made?

TEXT FROM EMAIL OF JUNE 26, 2022

FOLLOWS....

The most important number in the Chrome ATCM SRIA is 2.2 pounds. You can find it in Table 2.1 on page 21 of the SRIA. Go look at it. It is important. The total pre-pandemic hexavalent chrome emissions from chrome platers in California is 2.2 pounds annually. A fact – 2.2 pounds annually.

The most revealing number in the Chrome ATCM SRIA is 132 pounds. You can find this number on the top of page 2. It is the purpose for the rule. According to the SRIA, rule adoption will eliminate 132 pounds over 20 years. That is an average of 6.6 pounds per year. From a starting point of 2.2 pounds. It bears repeating. The new rule will eliminate 6.6 pounds per year from the currently emitted total of 2.2 pounds per year.

There would be no chrome platers after 2039 so emissions will be 0.0 pounds. Sacramento math is exposed. Specifically (2.2 - 6.6 = 0.0). Remember, the Chrome ATCM SRIA is a combined product of the California Air Resources Board and the California Department of Finance and yet it implicates the California Department of Education.

It is not a coincidence that CARB and the California Department of Finance separate these two numbers, the big flashy benefit savings on page 2 and the actual emissions on page 21. The key to big savings results are big baseline

assumptions. Section 1.6 and the footnotes in Table 2.1 describe the method and assumptions for establishing the baseline. The inflated baseline is justified in the following ways:

They create the concept of "potential" emissions. These are emissions that facilities could make, at the discretion of the facility, which are not currently prohibited by permit throughput limits. You are led to believe chrome emissions will, or could, go up to this level, but that is not a good assumption. Experience shows us that chrome plating emissions have done nothing but decline in California for decades.

They assume that pollution control equipment operates at no better than the permit efficiency level or lacking pollution control equipment, that facilities are emitting the maximum.

They created a magnification factor to account for data they did not collect from all facilities, and they chose the highest "at limit" assumption about that data.

Finally, they added a disclaimer, "Using emission limits may overestimate actual emissions at some facilities." A more accurate statement could have been "Using emission limits does overestimate actual emissions at facilities in aggregate" and they did do exactly that.

The result of this creativity is a baseline of 10.19 pounds per year if you read page 15 and 10.15 pounds per year if you look at Table 21. We could question the discrepancy between 10.19 and 10.15 but we will move on because there is something more important that you should be aware of. At the beginning of this email, we talked about 6.6 pounds per year of savings. That number is derived because the rule doesn't eliminate hex chrome until 2039 so it is an average over 20 years. Beginning in 2039, at elimination, the benefit is 10.15/10.19 pounds per year. So, the Sacramento math is even worse (2.20 – 10.19 = 0.00).

Let's get back to discussing the baseline assumptions - the "potential" emissions and "(in)efficiency" of pollution control devices. Chrome platers deserve some credit. They do currently operate within limits and are choosing to operate with a margin of safety below the limit. They do this to assure complete compliance. "Potential" emissions are foregone in order to assure compliance and are already achieved. Additionally, many chrome platers have invested in expensive pollution control equipment which operates at a higher efficiency than required by rule limits. Assuming inefficiency equal to the rule limit is not valid – especially in view of source test data in the possession of regulators that is referenced in the SRIA. So, the baseline is arbitrarily high. It assumes both these factors do not already exist. But they do. Emissions have already been reduced by the chrome plating industry. As a result of improvements in Rule 1469, there is not a need for additional regulation. This is plainly evident and explains the nearly 5 to 1 ratio between the baseline and actual experience. These concepts should not be used to inflate a baseline or to justify the costs proposed in this ATCM. The costs the rule would impose on plating firms and the California economy should not be justified by phantom elimination of emissions that have already been eliminated.

It is also important to understand that the

assumed baseline does not include fugitive emissions and that none of the quantified benefit is from fugitive emissions. Additionally, there is no quantified benefit from PFAS elimination. Despite the lack of data and specificity on either fugitives or PFAS, the benefits of eliminating them are discussed. This is unfortunate and misleading. The discussion attempts to provide a basis for the board to support (and perhaps vote for) this rule proposal in the absence of data. Do not be misled. Fugitives and PFAS evoke fear. Without quantification or estimation, they should not be discussed. If they can be quantified, CARB should present the data so that it can be discussed effectively. Note, there are already rules in place and in development against use of PFAS. Additionally, AQMD Rule 1469 already has significant controls against fugitive emissions.

Hexavalent chrome in ambient California air is at record low levels, see
<https://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/toxics/statepages/cr6state.html>. The 2.2 pounds which would be eliminated by the proposed rule are a factor of 10X less than at least one other non-mobile hexavalent chromium source known to the CARB and to SC AQMD. Effective regulation of hexavalent chromium in California demands that regulatory resources are directed at the most fertile opportunities for improvement. The chrome plating industry has been highly regulated in California. Industry emissions improved before the adoption of SC AQMD rule 1469 and should be expected to continue to improve following its’ update in 2019. It should be noted that 2019 is the basis for many of the datapoints in the SRIA and 2.2 pounds is likely a high estimate of current emissions. There is not a need for a new CARB rule. Application of the current SC AQMD Rule 1469 to the entire State of California is a much more effective path.

Thanks for your time. The Hex Chrome ATCM referenced repeatedly in this email can be found here.
<https://dof.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/Forecasting/Economics/Documents/SRIA-Chrome.pdf>

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-14 08:54:26

No Duplicates.

Comment 16 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Brett

Last Name: Cowan

Email Address: bmcowan@msn.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Ban on Hex Chrome in California

Comment:

My name is Brett Cowan an I've been an automotive mechanic and classic car enthusiast for over 30 years. I'm writing today to oppose the ban on Hex chrome in California. Not only will this do nothing to diminish any pollution in the state of California it will merely drive out more small businesses that barely got by during your Draconian measures put into place during the great Covid 19 debacle. This seems to be a witch hunt against the automotive industry that seems to be one of Gavin Newsome's favorite past times. It doesn't appear the science behind this decision really has any merit. Once again the State of California is attacking the freedoms and rights of working class citizens with false accusations and unproven science. Quit focusing on the small Mom and Pop shops that make this country and this State what it is and focus on the real issues (homelessness, crime, political insider trading, illegal immigration, fentanyl) just to name a few.

Thank you....Brett Cowan

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-14 17:22:12

No Duplicates.

Comment 17 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Eric

Last Name: Svenson, Jr

Email Address: ericjr@plating.com

Affiliation: Plating Resources, Inc.

Subject: Hexavalent Chrome

Comment:

Hexavalent chrome platers produce approximately 1% of the hexavalent chrome emissions in the State of California. How does the air quality improve by closing these facilities? CARB should by focusing on restricting the sources that make up the other 99% of hexavalent chrome emissions to improve California's air quality.

There is no suitable replacement for hexavalent chrome. The market rejects trivalent "decorative" chrome; and no process comes close to the functionality and benefits of hard chrome, which is a requirement for specifications such as Boeing BAC5709, MIL-STD-150F and many others. A ban on hexavalent chrome would negatively impact the defense and aerospace industry in California.

Please submit the attachment to the Public Record.

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/23-chromeatcm2023-UDhXNFcuUmBVJVQ1.pdf>'

Original File Name: Hexavalent Chrome.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-19 07:38:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 18 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Appendix B (The Emissions Inventory) is not correct

Comment:

Appendix B contains data errors, spreadsheet errors, calculation errors, and assumption errors. To the extent it is the source of any allegations, conclusions, statements, or any logic basis in support of the ISOR, SRIA, or the rule formulation, it should be corrected.

The data shown for our facility shows incorrect emissions, incorrect emission permit limits, and incorrect source test emission rates. It is difficult to find any row of data in the appendix that correctly represents any facility.

If CARB is able to identify the correct data and calculations to support the rule making, we request a new 45 day comment period following the release of a new appendix B. It is only fair.

A rule making like this, in which there is an opportunity to decrease overall hexavalent chrome emissions in the state by 0.2% and will eliminate thousands of jobs, damage the state economy, and disrupt several industries deserves to be based on correct data.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-19 14:26:35

No Duplicates.

Comment 19 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Toward Rule Improvement

Comment:

As stated previously, the rule language itself could improve by...

1) Recognizing that some chrome platers who do not use PFAS/PFOS, are not located near schools, are not located near sensitive receptors, have fully compliant HEPA systems and 1469 compliance, are located in CalEnviroScore areas with no population and therefore no CalEnviroScore, but perform vital work that supports the national commercial aviation and DOD infrastructure (e.g...us) should have a right to exist until a substitute technology can be identified. Don't ban us before the replacing technology is identified, ban us after the replacing technology is identified. For us, the substitute technology won't be trivalent plating. Take out the ban language associated with hard chrome platers - no one can raise capital with that in there.

2) Implementing AQMD 1469 statewide. That's it. No need for anything else.

3) Reducing the source test requirement to a frequency of five years.

4) Allowing currently permitted facilities to add/change permits so long as compliant to emissions regulations (i.e..1469).

5) Allowing decorative platers a way to comply rather than a hard ban.

Thank you for your consideration.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-19 16:13:06

No Duplicates.

Comment 20 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Computing the Cancer Risk for my facility

Comment:

Let's look at the risk from our facility using the data that CARB provides on pages 173 to 175 of the ISOR. CARB breaks the risk up into two pieces, the risk to residents, and the risk to off-site workers in the area.

We are located in an industrial zone in the 90813 zip code area. There are no residential buildings within 500 meters. According to figure V.1 that means that our cancer risk to residents is ZERO.

Yes, zero risk to residents. But, let's go on and look at offsite worker risks. At the bottom of page 175, CARB states, and I quote,

"For the 2019 baseline, the estimated potential cancer risks range approximately from less than one in a million to 17 chances per million, depending on the level of plating operations at the facility."

So, we can use this to compute the cancer risk. Even though 17 in a million is the worst case, and even though it would be better for my illustration to use one in a million, we will use the higher number; even though we are a smaller facility. How many offsite workers are there around us? We don't know for sure but we can make a useful estimate.

The 90813 zip code is one of the densest in the state (#31 as a matter of fact) and has a density of 18,175 people per square mile. If we draw a circle around our facility at a radius of 500 meters, the area is 0.3 square miles. Applying a little arithmetic, we can compute an estimate of 5,452 workers within that circle if the work force is dispersed at a similar density to residents. But maybe it is not, so let's make an extreme assumption about the number of workers within 500 meters of us and say it is 25,000. Our assumption is between 5,000 and 25,000 people work within 500 meters of us. Using the highest figure, we can compute that 0.425 offsite workers (25,000 X 0.000017 = 0.425) might get cancer. Let me repeat that number 0.425.

And looking at a previous sentence CARB states that, and I quote: "The guidelines assume that a worker at a nearby worksite is exposed to the emissions for 25 years, 250 days per year, and 8 hours per day."

So, in order to get 0.425 cases of cancer, we need 25,000 people to stay within 500 meters of this facility for 8 hours a day, 250 days per year, for 25 years!

There it is, for my facility, using CARB's numbers and conservative assumptions, we get less than 1/2 of one cancer case. I hope you get the point.

So why after more than three years of engagement in this ATCM process with CARB and the preceding rule 1469 process with AQMD and CARB is this small business dealing with the existential threat of a ban? Who is in charge? Is anyone at CARB capable of making a decision to stop this madness? Is this what AB 617 hath wrought? We are being damaged.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-21 15:23:31

No Duplicates.

Comment 21 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Enjoy your Holiday Air Travel

Comment:

Metal finishing disciplines support commercial aircraft. Decorative chrome is mostly used on interiors. Functional anodize is used all over the aircraft to protect parts from corrosion. Hard Chrome is used to assure the correct function of thrust reversers, landing gear, rudder and aileron actuators, propulsion systems, and other flight and landing critical components.

If any members of the CARB board are traveling over the holidays, you are only able to do so because the aviation industry has used hexavalent chromium in California to keep you safe.

Hard chrome platers support manufacturing, processing, repair and maintenance of critical aircraft components. We follow the explicit direction of engineers within the OEMs and the airlines, and use federal and internationally recognized standards to perform the work. In the United States, the design, production, and maintenance of all aircraft are under the jurisdiction of the FAA who audit and enforce the strict adherence to the requirements. Those requirements dictate the use of hexavalent chrome. People go to jail and/or are fined if regulations are not followed.

The United States aviation infrastructure is interstate commerce. Aircraft repair and maintenance is a necessary part of that infrastructure. The CARB does not have authority to regulate interstate commerce.

Despite formal efforts by the US government and the aviation community to identify a hard chrome alternative in the late 90's, the industry has not yet found suitable alternatives. This ATCM is not going to change the realities of physics, materials, etc.. Your flight is only able to occur because hexavalent chromium makes it safe and possible.

Even the newest Boeing 787 aircraft which will be manufactured for the foreseeable future and will fly for decades are designed to be made and maintained with hexavalent chrome. Every aircraft in the world contains a part that was hexavalent chrome plated in California. Aircraft have usable lives spanning decades and will persist beyond 2039. The California economy depends on tourism. A hard chrome ban is misguided hypocrisy.

Enjoy your flight.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-22 08:56:05

No Duplicates.

Comment 22 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jerry

Last Name: Redding

Email Address: jerryredding55@yahoo.com

Affiliation: Sherman custom plating

Subject: Hexavalent chrome

Comment:

Hexavalent chrome I work at Sherms custom plating in Sacramento California my dad started this company 50 years ago we have always abided by the rules and put in all of the safety equipment air scrubbers etc. by eliminating hexavalent chrome all of our or most of our client base will just simply go out of state to get their work done we are a small shop in Sacramento California I don't think it's fair that the hard chroming industry gets 10 years allowance to go about business in a normal manner whereas decorative chrome players only have four years before rulings are made I don't think that's fair our emissions are zero detectable because we use air scrubbers on the chromium bath please reconsider these unfair rulings on the Hexavalent chrome.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-22 19:40:32

No Duplicates.

Comment 23 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Changes / Comment Period

Comment:

I have provided input that there are discrepancies and errors in and between the ISOR, the SRIA, and the proposed rule. I request that those documents be updated to correct the discrepancies and logic failures (e.g... annual emission reduction being greater than annual emissions, rule motivation attributed to environmental justice concerns but unsupported by documented AB 617 CERPs in the EJ communities, and more...). To the extent the rule might be changed to address the comments of myself and others, I request that the public be given 45 days to analyze the changes and provide comment. This is reasonable considering that individual members of the public and owner/managers of small businesses do not have sufficient time and resources as do large corporations and the State of California to devote to analyzing the rule.

This rule making is an excellent example of the difficulty that small businesses have in working with California regulators.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-28 13:45:42

No Duplicates.

Comment 24 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Bobbi

Last Name: Burns

Email Address: bobbiburns@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Amendment to Chrome ATCM

Comment:

For those reading public comments that may not be aware, Hexavalent Chromium can be found in many places in our everyday lives. Besides nature and plating shops, Hexavalent Chromium is found within industries of aerospace, ground transportation, concrete, welding, leather tanning, wood preserving, fireworks (there goes Disneyland), cosmetics, cleaning agents and tobacco. Some everyday items include products in our home like electronics, fixtures, hardware, furniture and keys. The Chromium finishes are essential to automobiles including electric cars, aerospace, industrial machinery, dies and molds; metal finishing adds a variety of protection, wear resistance, and in some cases restoration.

Permits, inspections, testing and fees are the standard for any Chromium plating facility in California. Regulations here in California are the most stringent in the USA. California sets the standard and is the leader of environmental innovations in the Country. The proposed ban on Decorative Chrome in the upcoming amendment to the ATCM simply doesn't make sense.

Banning the Decorative Chrome process here does not make the demand for the finish go away. There are countless manufacturing and restoration companies here in this State that will have to close or ship parts to other States, other States that have little to no control on the process, creating a new wave of problems. The technology used today to prevent pollution is superior to what was used decades ago.

"In 2007, to further protect the public, CARB adopted additional amendments to the Chrome Plating ATCM, resulting in the most stringent and health protective emission standards applicable to chrome plating operations in the nation." This sentence was plucked straight from CARB's website.

Since 2007 there has been a significant reduction in CrVI emissions from plating facilities. We account for less than 1% of the total CrVI emissions in the entire State. My point is that we are not a failed regulated industry. The proposed amendment should create an emission base rule for all covered process equally. The Decorative, Functional and Chromic Acid Anodize have the same chemistry so why ban just one? The amendment should be an emission based rule for any hexavalent chromium process. The Decorative Chrome process averages 10k to 40K amp-hrs annually but the Hard or Functional Chrome and Chromic Acid Anodize process can run-up to and over a million amp-hrs annually. It is discrimination.

Proposing alternatives such as Tri-Chrome for decorative finishes should be an alternative, not the only choice. If a Decorative Chrome facility is meeting the emission standard, under the threshold or non-detect for CrVI emissions then why shut it down? The ATCM Amendment should be based on science and data, not emotions. Imposing a discriminatory ban on this process sets a bad precedent for California.

I strongly urge CARB to stand by the side of California businesses that have maintained compliance and continue to invest in better technologies so that we can continue our craft and be of service to not only the large manufacturers but the hobbyist and enthusiasts that rely on our finishes. The stationary source of this hexavalent chromium is under control of not only the Operators, who are certified by CARB's program but also by the local Air Districts. I am a second generation metal finisher for over thirty years. I am in good health. My long-time employees are in good health. If I thought I was endangering my family or community we wouldn't be in business. Thank you for reading my comments.

Biological fun facts: Ingested Cr(VI) is efficiently reduced to the Cr(III) by the gastric juices [De Flora, Badolati et al. 1987]. Cr(VI) can also be reduced to the Cr(III) in the epithelial lining fluid of the lungs by ascorbate and glutathione (Petrilli, Rossi et al. 1986; Suzuki and Fukuda 1990). Once absorbed into the bloodstream, Cr(VI) is rapidly taken up by erythrocytes after absorption and reduced to Cr(III) inside the red blood cells. In contrast, Cr(III) does not readily cross red blood cell membranes, but binds directly to transferrin, an iron-transporting protein in the plasma (made by the liver) EPA 1998; ATSDR 2000; Dayan and Paine 2001].

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-29 13:13:44

No Duplicates.

Comment 25 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Art

Last Name: Holman

Email Address: art@shermplating.com

Affiliation: Sherm's Custom Plating

Subject: 2022 Chrome emissions

Comment:

I would like for the board to look at decorative platers emissions and clearly state why we are being targeted for elimination in California when we are already highly regulated and have zero threat to public safety when operating under current ATCM.

I will publicly post my emissions for the 2022 year with data to prove that shops like mine are not the problem and should not be required to transition to trivalent or close down operations.

2022 I used 31,322 amp/hrs at a source test rating of 0.00032
The math is $31,322 \times 0.00032 = 10.02304$ milligrams for all of 2022.

To put this in perspective a paperclip = 1 gram.

It would take my facility 100 years at these rates to produce 1 gram of chrome, a paperclip worth! Can you see how ridiculous this is? you have the ability to look at true data on emissions in the industry and the facts speak for themselves.

Before any decision on a new ATCM is reached the board really needs to look at facts, the overwhelming majority of platers all have amp/hr meters and source test documentation that proves the chrome plating industry as a whole is not the problem with hexavalent chrome emissions.

Ships, Rail, Concrete, and mobile sources are huge contributors, and this new rule will do nothing to change that it will only drive chrome platers out of state where they are not regulated as tightly as here in California.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-30 07:03:25

No Duplicates.

Comment 26 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Paramount (Dichromate Seal Tanks)

Comment:

Air monitoring in Paramount revealed that dichromate seal tanks were a source of hex chrome and that CARB and AQMD had NO RULE to control dichromate seal tanks! The tanks were unregulated. An uproar ensued. CARB and AQMD came under fire. How could they let this happen? Blame had to be assessed. Round up the usual suspects...chrome platers! A new rule was made. Media headlines blamed platers but the firms with dichromate seal tanks were NOT decorative chrome platers and were NOT hard chrome platers. CARB's allegations about fugitive plating emissions from "uncontrolled tanks" are based on this situation in Paramount and on another in Newport Beach. But, again, the Newport Beach firm is NOT a decorative chrome and NOT a hard chrome plater either. So why does this rule target decorative and hard chrome plating? Why does it justify action based on "fugitive plating emissions from uncontrolled tanks" when hard and decorative platers don't have dichromate seal tanks? How did CARB draw a line from Dichromate seal tanks to hard chrome and decorative chrome platers?

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-12-30 12:22:49

No Duplicates.

Comment 27 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Rich

Last Name: Roberson

Email Address: richroberson@outlook.com

Affiliation:

Subject: CARB Chrome Plating ATCM

Comment:

Re: CARB Chrome Plating ATCM

Eugene,

I would like to express concern of a complete ban of Hexavalent Hard Chrome plating on behalf of our Team members here at Roll Technology West (RTW).

Our Team members invested time into their profession and have made it not just a job, but a career.

Our team members are puzzled why the career they chose, is being targeted for a complete ban. They are bewildered why an industry that makes up less than 1% of hex chromium emissions nationally, is being targeted for elimination.

RTW's Team members have always done the right thing and followed all the rules, procedures, and permits.

"And we must recognize that communities of color have a range of views and concerns. "-CARB Chair Randolph

RTW's team members have children and grandchildren who are all are part of a community of color. They work in this community. They have homes in this community.

"We cannot fail in our efforts to listen, engage, and work towards equitable solutions as best we can. "-Chair Randolph

The complete ban of Hexavalent chrome plating is the exact opposite of equitable solution. There is no alternative for the Hexavalent Hard chrome plating of Work rolls.

Our team members would be laid off and because their career is banned, the skills, which they have worked so hard to hone, would be worthless.

This would be traumatic for our Team members, families, and community.

I understand CARB's quest to look for an alternative to Hexavalent Hard chrome plating. However, there is no viable alternative for the Hexavalent Chrome plating of Work rolls.

Therefore, I ask CARB not to institute a complete ban on Hexavalent Hard chrome but rather, consider a more equitable solution and adopt the European model and grant conditional exemptions until a viable and proven alternative is found.

If granted, a conditional exemption would give RTW the ability to remain in operation until a viable and proven alternative is found.

Sincerely,

Richard Roberson

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-04 14:48:12

No Duplicates.

Comment 28 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: JIM

Last Name: MEYER

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Atmospheric Rivers and Hex Chrome

Comment:

We are currently experiencing an "atmospheric river" event (as the press likes to call it) that is predicted to result in downed trees and power lines, flooding, and mudslides throughout the state. I don't know if that prediction will hold, as weather can be unpredictable, but I do know this...

The hydraulic actuation mechanisms on the bulldozers, earthmovers, and backhoes that will clear the roads, restore your power, repair the dams, and reinforce the hillsides are MANUFACTURED AND REPAIRED with HEXAVALENT CHROME by hard chrome platers. Your decision will have consequences. Please don't be naive about what protects you, your property, and the citizens of California and allows the taxpayers to pay your salaries.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-05 06:47:36

No Duplicates.

Comment 29 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Kelly

Last Name: Wiley

Email Address: Kcwiley5@gmail.com

Affiliation: Sherm's Custom Plating

Subject: Chrome Ban in California

Comment:

My name is Kelly Wiley. I have worked for Sherm's Custom Plating in Sacramento, Ca for 16 years. That is a majority of my working life. I am a single women, who owns her own home (thanks in part to my employment at Sherm's), and is on track to be a part of the ownership group at Sherm's. I would be a female owner in a male driven industry. This has been the goal for the last 10 years. If Sherm's is forced to stop doing hex chrome plating we will loose our customer base, thereby shutting us down. I would be a middle aged women looking for employment whose skills and knowledge base lay mostly in the chrome plating industry.

Sherm's has always maintained a clean facility and followed all of the guidelines set in place by different regulatory groups. Please give us the opportunity to adhere to guidelines rather then banning chrome all together. My future and that of the people I work with, are depending on you. Thank you for your time.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-05 09:00:59

No Duplicates.

Comment 30 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Technology Reviews are undefined and vaguely timed

Comment:

The proposed rule establishes the timing of two "technology reviews" which will be used to determine when and whether functional and hard chrome platers should be eliminated earlier than 2039.

The rule includes no definition of "technology review". It should be obvious this is a problem.

The rule states only that the first technology review must be "complete...by January 1, 2032." Therefore, the first technology review could occur in 2023 and the rule would be met. Hard chrome platers and anodize facilities could be eliminated before decorative per this rule.

There is no basis for any business to invest capital (or stay) in California if CARB can eliminate them by performing an undefined process, maybe tomorrow, or maybe sometime in the next ten years. What is a reasonable person (and business, and concerned citizen, and etc.) to conclude? Is this how CARB writes rules now? After more than three years of effort?

The only thing we can know about CARB's intended "technology review" is what we see has occurred with respect to the decorative chrome platers and the review of trivalent chrome plating technology. What was the venue in which this occurred? Who organized and conducted the review? Who was asked to participate in the review? How much diversity of opinion was allowed in the process and how was it dealt with to reach conclusions? How did CARB assess the needs of customers in the marketplace? Were decorative platers involved in the review? Who advocated that trivalent chrome was an acceptable substitute? When, how, and who made the decision that "trivalent chrome" could substitute? Do CARB, CARB staff, CARB board members have any economic interest in research or firms associated with trivalent chrome technology? So many unanswered questions.

The proposed undefined and vaguely timed "technology reviews" are unacceptable.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-06 07:29:57

No Duplicates.

Comment 31 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: John

Last Name: Romero

Email Address: chromer9@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation: west coast chrome

Subject: the myth

Comment:

There are over 500 substances that are probable carcinogens including auto exhaust, cigarettes, processed meats etc. basically what they are saying is that hex chrome causes cancer along with all those other items, this really is a myth, has it been proven to be a carcinogen, a carcinogen is a substance that causes cancer, I have been in business or 30 years. All those years I have never heard of anyone dying or even becoming ill from chrome. I have been doing all my chrome plating myself and yet I am still here and in good health. I am small 2 man shop not a threat to human health in any way and have proof of it. recently the epa conducted a site investigation on my shop. I spent an enormous amount of money on lawyer fees geologist fees etc. They took soil samples septic tank samples cameras through the plumbing. In the end the test results came back (nd) non detected for chrome, nickel, copper or any other hazardous material. Therefore my shop is not a threat to public health, furthermore I am one of the smallest shops in California, I am only allowed 66 amp hrs per day, but only do about 20 per day, mostly small parts. With that being said how can my shop be a threat to anyone. If they do pass this law, I can't see how these businesses will survive. The sad thing is probably about 90 percent workers and/ or owners are hispanic such as myself. that have been doing this for a very long time. thank you for your time

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-07 21:12:46

No Duplicates.

Comment 32 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Why has CARB stopped updating Hex Chrome Statistics?

Comment:

Any discussion about hex chrome rules should be based on data and that data should be made available to the public in a transparent and accurate manner.

CARB has posted data about Hex Chrome at their own website here: (<https://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/toxics/statepages/cr6state.html>). Thank you CARB. The data include helpful computations for MEAN levels of hex chrome and ESTIMATED RISK of hex chrome statewide since 1991. Please note the improvements made over that time. For reasons which are not clear to this reader, CARB has stopped supplying the MEANS and the ESTIMATED RISKS since the beginning of this rulemaking. I could guess that this is because some months do not contain data but this is curious given the higher number of observations shown. Even more baffling is the lack of data observations shown in the second half of 2022. Why would CARB stop sharing data with the public concurrent with this rule making and leading up to a CARB board decision? Coincidence? It is hard to see this as coincidence and it is especially troubling when we have also learned from CARB that the data in appendix B is not correct. Why is data about hex chrome emissions less available and less reliable just as the CARB board and the public and the impacted parties are approaching decision?

Um... We deserve answers.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-09 15:13:52

No Duplicates.

Comment 33 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Less than 2 Hex Chrome Cancer Cases in California (Annually)

Comment:

It would be nice if there were a reliable source of data from which to perform these calculations. See my previous comment(s).

But using the data we have...

The California population is around 40 million. So using the most recent CARB data that show a cancer case rate attributable to hex chrome of 16 per million, that computes to 640 cancer cases from hex chrome annually statewide. See my source here - <https://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/toxics/statepages/cr6state.html>

How many of those are from chrome platers?

CARB's Appendix B states chrome platers emit 0.90 pounds of hex chrome annually. SC AQMD states that there are 0.8 pounds per day of Hex chrome emissions in the South Coast basin (see data in SC AQMD MATES V Table 3-4) from all sources. That computes to 292 pounds annually ($0.8 \times 365 = 292$). So in the South Coast area chrome platers make up 0.3% ($0.9 / 292 = 0.0031$) of the hex chrome emissions in the area that everyone would agree contains the highest percentage of chrome platers in the state.

So, since chrome platers make up 0.3% of emissions we can compute the cancer cases attributable to chrome platers as 1.98 cases per year.

1.98 CANCER CASES PER YEAR IN CALIFORNIA FROM HEX CHROME ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE ENTIRE CHROME PLATING INDUSTRY!!

Who is in control of CARB? What is the agenda? Setting priorities is one of the most basic functions of management. CARB has spent three years on this rule making.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-09 16:04:38

No Duplicates.

Comment 34 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Thomas

Last Name: Mulhall

Email Address: bayareashopsol@gmail.com

Affiliation: Bay Area Shop Solutions

Subject: Killing Chrome=Killing Jobs

Comment:

Another attack on the automotive restoration and repair industry is your latest brain child: Going after the hex chrome platers. That industry represents less than 1% of the total Chrome VI emissions for the entire State of Ca. This industry is absolutely vital to the automotive manufacturing, repair, and restoration industries. The last thing that Ca needs is more job killing bureaucrats who worship the almighty carbon lie. Attached is a chart that clearly shows the carbon levels being significantly higher throughout history, BEFORE the advent of the automobile! To kill off another industry like chrome plating is utter madness. There is no reason, other than self-perpetuating legislation, and the vindictive nature towards automobiles that CARB has demonstrated, to kill off the chrome plating industry. We haven't forgotten about the killing off of good paint and brake cleaner that you pencil pushers did to use!

San Francisco used to have 3 marvelous platers. One in particular, B&M, was so good that chrome parts that were plated in 1965 are still on some show vehicles today! Now, everyone in the Bay Area has to travel to Sacramento to get good chrome plating. How many useless miles are traveled, and time, fuel, bridge tolls, etc expended all because CARB shut down the platers in SF? Not very environmentally conscious, is that?

Cut it out and go after the real polluters, like the thousands of illegal aliens who litter our state with filth.

Thank you

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/41-chromeatcm2023-VDcFYgBzBTRSO1A+.jpg>'

Original File Name: carbon1jpg.jpg

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-09 23:22:33

No Duplicates.

Comment 35 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Zain

Last Name: Yahya

Email Address: zainyahya@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: ATCM for hex chrome

Comment:

I am still trying to understand the basis for this ruling. If the goal is protect the public health then why are we instituting a ban on this process as opposed to regulating it. The industry accounts for less than 1% of hex chrome emissions in the state. Why not target a larger chunk of the pie. Also, when the industry welcomes regulation and says we can get that number down even further. Why would CARB choose a ban rather than working with industry and helping to reduce those emissions.

Businesses will be forced to close, thousands of jobs will be lost, supply chains and consumers will have to find sources outside of the State of California(this impact cannot be overstated). Other States that do not have the regulations and controls that California shops have in place.

The three finishes of Decorative, Functional Chrome Metal Finishing and

Chromic Acid Anodizing represent less than 1% of total ChromeVI Emissions for the entire State of California. Why does this warrant a ban?

Fun Fact: Based on the reported annual emissions CARB provided (2018-2019) all of the decorative chrome platers in the state emitted less hexavalent chromium at .00856 lbs per year than the popular theme park resort in Anaheim at 0.106 lbs per year.

Please reconsider this draconian rule that continues to be illogical given the stated goals of CARB.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-11 13:13:07

No Duplicates.

Comment 36 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Aaron

Last Name: Plechaty

Email Address: aplechaty@electro-coatings.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Banning is not the answer...

Comment:

I have worked at/around a chrome plating shop for 26 years, you are looking to take the quick and easy road and just kill off an industry. The industry has stated time, and time again that we are willing and able to discuss and work through tighter regulations and rules. This is the ideal way forward.

The complete ban on chrome plating in any time frame is not practical. We as an industry produce less than 1% of all hex chrome emissions, who/what/where are the 99%? What are you doing about limiting the excess emissions from all the bigger places and companies and names? By attacking the smallest group, you will be shutting down small businesses in the state, and forcing jobs out of state - because people will not suddenly stop wanting chrome, they will just have to get it from other places (who most likely have lesser emissions standards and thus affect even more people).

Please consider pushing back any rules or voting, unless all the research is complete, until the actual facts are verified and we can all move forward together and not leave thousands of people without jobs.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-12 08:05:48

No Duplicates.

Comment 37 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: steve

Last Name: Weeks

Email Address: steveweeks900@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: chromeatcm2023

Comment:

I have been made aware of this proposed ban. I am not in favor. California is recognized as almost the birthplace of auto customization. Chrome plating is an extremely minor part of our emissions. There must be other options other than a complete ban. This is one more reason to be ridiculed by other states and part of the bigger picture why so many people are leaving this once great state. The elitist attitude that as California goes so should the country is doing us harm in many ways. Please reconsider.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-12 10:00:26

No Duplicates.

Comment 38 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Matthew
Last Name: Pankow
Email Address: mattp@platinginternational.com
Affiliation: Plating Internatioanl Inc.

Subject: Chromium
Comment:

The current standards in place have dramatically reduced emissions in regard to Chrome Plating and Anodizing and I don't see how an amendment is justified. An amendment would negatively impact the industry, local manufacturers and move more business to other countries around the world.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-13 10:38:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 39 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: HEPA Filtration not BACT anymore?

Comment:

This ATCM imposes a ban on hex chrome use for hard chrome plating even though there is not an alternative. Since the ban is imposed even though hard chrome platers do use state of the art HEPA filtration systems, CARB is establishing a precedent that HEPA filtration systems are inadequate for management of carcinogens. This has major implications for not only hex chrome, but for nearly all the other air toxics in California. CARB would be saying that HEPA filtration is no longer the Best Available Control Technology. A ban would now be the best available control technology.

But HEPA filters are effective for control of hex chrome as evidenced by all the other CARB and district rules which require use of HEPA enclosures and booths and which have not been proposed to be revised. There is a long list.

Is it CARB's strategy to start with platers to eliminate HEPA filtration as a control method? Are they using us as some sort of Machiavellian example to everyone else. Cull out all the small business platers, win a key case, and then move on to the bigger polluters that make up 99% of the hex chrome problem. Hmmm, very shrewd.

It would be false for CARB to state that the ban is necessary due to fugitive (non-HEPA) emissions since CARB has not measured fugitives (or admitted to doing so) at hard chrome platers. Fugitive emissions observed in Paramount and Newport Beach were not from hard chrome plating.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-13 10:36:22

No Duplicates.

Comment 40 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: James

Last Name: Goehring

Email Address: jrgjrgus@outlook.com

Affiliation: Manager

Subject: Proposed ATCM amendments

Comment:

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/47-chromeatcm2023-AHNTAHNTNwB4VIAdqM0d.pdf>'

Original File Name: ltr for public comment - CARB.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-14 12:01:20

No Duplicates.

Comment 41 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Rule Purpose according to the SRIA

Comment:

The opening paragraph of the SRIA sets forth the purpose for the rulemaking. It is artfully crafted, but misleads the CARB board and the people of California.

It states "The electrolytic processes associated with plating operations cause mists containing hexavalent chromium to be released from plating tanks, which are eventually emitted into outdoor air through building openings and vents. Despite control systems installed at chrome plating facilities, hexavalent chromium emissions continue to be released from facilities into the surrounding environment and communities. Fugitive emissions occur because the control systems do not capture 100 percent of the emissions from these facilities. Many of these facilities are located close to sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, residential care facilities, and homes where children and elderly reside), and are also located in disadvantaged communities."

Let's look at how misleading that paragraph is and how it is being misapplied by CARB.

"The electrolytic processes associated with plating operations cause mists containing hexavalent chromium to be released from plating tanks, which are eventually emitted into outdoor air through building openings and vents". This statement is NOT factually correct at hard chrome plating facilities with emission control systems. At hard chrome plating facilities, 100% of hard chrome plating tank mists are captured by the push pull headers of the emission control systems and directed into HEPA filters which at 99.97% efficiency reduce the pollutants to nearly nothing, This is confirmed by regulatorily required source testing. CARB knows this and SCAQMD knows this. But the writer needs to setup an argument about fugitive emissions and they need the reader to believe that mists are created and flying around in the air. They also want the reader to believe these emissions are coming from plating tanks and not from rinse or other associated tanks (for example, dichromate seal tanks) - which is a VERY important distinction. It takes a stretch of logic to call a dichromate seal tank a "plating tank" but that is what the writer does. Let's look at the next sentence.

"Despite control systems installed at chrome plating facilities, hexavalent chromium emissions continue to be released from facilities into the surrounding environment and communities." CARB

may have reasons for being vague with this statement but it is highly misleading. It is a diplomatic allusion to joint failures of the regulatory community) and the management practices at unnamed facilities in Southern California. CARB may not want to be specific about the facilities but a review of media reports lead to identification of Anaplex in Paramount and Hixson Metal Finishing in Newport Beach. If there are others, CARB has not identified them or the situations to which they allude. So there is no way to comment on them. For the record, it is very important to recognize that Anaplex is NOT a hard chrome plater and Hixson Metal Finishing is NOT a hard chrome plater. Neither of these firms had hard chrome plating tanks with HEPA emission control systems. The sentence is constructed artfully. It wants the reader to believe the facilities had emission controls. The truth? The facilities DID have emission controls, but certain tanks did not. As a result, there were releases into surrounding communities. CARB and SCAQMD should disclose to the public in a straight-forward way that the regulators did not require emission control systems on those dichromate seal tanks. CARB may have other data from which they can support the their contention of fugitive emissions but the lack of specificity and quantification is notable.

"Fugitive emissions occur because the control systems do not capture 100 percent of the emissions from these facilities." This is an artfully worded, factually true statement that implies equality between hard chrome plating tanks with HEPA systems capturing 99.97% of hex chrome, and to un-controlled dichromate tanks which happen to be located in a facility with controls. There is no distinction made about the level of fugitive emissions from the two vastly different facilities. It is used in this purpose paragraph to justify a sledgehammer approach which will be used to eliminate all chrome plating.

"Many of these facilities are located close to sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, residential care facilities, and homes where children and elderly reside), and are also located in disadvantaged communities." This is a true statement. The sentence could have said "Many of these facilities are located close to sensitive receptors and many are NOT located close to sensitive receptors." That is also a true statement but it does not serve the writer's cause to say it that way. The writer continues, "Some...are also located in disadvantaged communities". True. But, unsaid, some are NOT located in disadvantaged communities. Our facility is located in a community that is not scored by CalEnviroScreen because there is no residential population. Hixson Metal Finishing is located in a community with a 65th percentile score on CalEnviroScreen. Most readers will not perceive Newport Beach as a disadvantaged community.

The misleading purpose statement contained in the SRIA creates a decision environment for the CARB board which, in my opinion, creates a potential legal liability for the CARB and the State of California. The purpose as stated in the ISOR does not match the purpose in the SRIA. Further, since the rule would eliminate infrastructure that supports the largest industries in the state (Tourism, Agriculture, Automotive, Aerospace) some serious restructuring of this ATCM must be done. It is obviously unfair to hard chrome platers who have invested in HEPA systems and are compliant with the SCAQMD rules. It is unfair to California workers at impacted facilities and at links in the supply chains which are supported by hexavalent hard chrome platers. Please reconsider your approach to this rule-making.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-15 07:25:31

No Duplicates.

Comment 42 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: ATCM & SRIA Technology Assumptions Invalid

Comment:

The CARB ATCM SRIA estimates a benefit of 10 pounds of hex chrome per year. 86% of that benefit is derived from the impact of the ATCM on hard chrome platers. Yet, the ATCM does not identify any technology which is capable of replacing hard hex chrome plating. A technology is imagined for the purpose of cost and benefit estimation in the SRIA.

We are able to determine from the SRIA that the attributes of the imagined hard chrome plating technology are as follows:

Emissions - None

Implementation Cost - \$4 Million per facility

Method of applying the technology - undefined

On-going operational cost - Same as current technology

On-going operational process time - Same as current technology

Effectiveness of technology attributes - Same as current technology (with no analysis of hardness, lubricity, coefficient of friction, wear resistance, corrosion, porosity, method of application, etc..)

Technology adoption rate - immediate at implementation of the new technology

Technology adoption scope - all applications simultaneously

Technology development as it relates to hard chrome alternatives has been ongoing for more than 25 years and is well understood. The assumptions above are NOT consistent with the most likely technological development path for a hard chrome alternative in the future. The most likely technology development path will not have a binary yes/no ability to change technological attributes (named above) all at once across all applications.

This SRIA completely fails to recognize how technology change occurs and is implemented, yet it allows CARB to take credit for 86% of a benefit without associated recognition of cost.

There is no analysis of the costs to other supply chain participants (manufacturers, maintainers, etc...) from changing to the imagined technology in the this SRIA.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-15 07:39:23

No Duplicates.

Comment 43 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: US Federal Law is superior to California Law

Comment:

Aviation Repair Solutions, Inc. repairs commercial aircraft parts as a participant in interstate commerce and under the purview of the Federal Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration. As such, we are legally required by federal law to perform our work in concert with FAA regulation. FAA regulation requires us to repair parts in compliance with FAA approved repairs. FAA approved repairs require us to use hexavalent chrome plating. If we do not use hexavalent chrome plating we are in conflict with federal law.

The proposed CARB ATCM violates the commerce clause and supremacy clauses of the United States Constitution.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-15 09:27:45

No Duplicates.

Comment 44 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Kyle

Last Name: Cassano

Email Address: kylecassano@mac.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Do NOT ban hex chrome plating in CA

Comment:

California is the most regulated state in the country for chrome plating, which makes it the safest and most responsible state in the country to perform chrome plating.

This ban is not based on science... it will harm businesses and your constituents. Reconsider... do not ban.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-15 16:44:46

No Duplicates.

Comment 45 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Luke

Last Name: Kidd

Email Address: motorsatan@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: ban the mouse

Comment:

According to your own CARB reporting for 2018/2019 a single Anaheim theme park produced more hexavalent chromium than all California chrome shops combined. Why are you not passing laws to shut down the monster which is Disney Land? Going after small business all across the state only hurts our citizens, the ones you are elected to serve. Please rethink what you are proposing and do the right thing.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 11:59:26

No Duplicates.

Comment 46 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Cathy

Last Name: Ream

Email Address: cream@teikuro.com

Affiliation: Teikuro Corporation

Subject: Chrome Ban

Comment:

It is not possible to put a timeline on banning hexavalent chromium because there is not a "one size fits all" solution to replacing hexavalent chromium coatings as the function and properties needed can be different for different products. Sometimes, it can even be impossible.

I have not worked with trivalent chromium but I understand that the color is different than hexavalent chrome, usually a whitish color. Do you think consumers want "white" bumpers and chrome trim on their automobiles and restored automobiles? Do they want a white kitchen faucet?

Chromium electroplaters and anodizers in California have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars, to meet the current low emmisions regulations for hex chrome. Of these companies, some are large and some are small. Some would survive a hex chrome ban, but many, especially the smaller ones that only work with chromium, would not. What happens to the owners when they have to walk away from the money that they already have invested?

I have worked in the metal finishing business for over 40 years, chromic anodizing in the past and the majority of my career and most recently with hexavalent chrome industrial electroplating, so I am speaking about electroplating in that it is a unique process and the operators have a unique and special skill. Many have spent the majority of their careers in this business and are facing the possibility of losing their jobs if the ban is enacted. I understand that the industrial chrome ban won't be effective for 17 years, but the decorative chrome ban is much sooner. With these special skills, what kind of employment will they be able to obtain at the ages a lot of them are? Even in 17 years, most probably won't be retirement age yet, so I don't think that you are considering the effect it will have on the workers and their subsequent employmen....and the supply chain workers and customers.

The PFOS/PFAS issue is a whole, separate and different issue. PFOS was and PFAS is being used legally. Getting rid of hex chrome should not have as it's goal to get rid of PFAS.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 11:41:56

No Duplicates.

Comment 47 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: matt

Last Name: theobald

Email Address: matt.theobald@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Chrome and Safe Operation

Comment:

Please consider the facts regarding going after the decorative chrome plating industry, the impact of moving the business out of the state is just moving the problem.

I work in industries where challenging chemistry is often a problem, I would rather see the business and processes stay in a state where people are motivated to operate and control them safely, rather than have the shipped outside where others may not operate so safely.

The need for decorative chrome will remain, please keep it in a state where there is motivation to operate it safely.

-Matt Theobald

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 12:40:34

No Duplicates.

Comment 48 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Albert

Last Name: Ybarra Jr.

Email Address: 805dicos@gmail.com

Affiliation: Sherms Custom Plating

Subject: Chrome Ban in California

Comment:

My name is Albert Ybarra Jr. I am a second generation polisher at Sherms Custom Plating in Sacramento. I starting working at Sherms right out of high school. I am now 38 years old. I was able to purchase my home when I was 25 years old due to the steady employment and how hard I have worked in my career. I am now the shops foreman and on track to be apart of the ownership group. By taking away chrome not only will you be taking away my job, but my fathers job as well. I pride myself in what I do for the automotive industry and it shows in the quality product our facility puts out. We also take pride in the cleanliness of our facility. Please give us an emissions standard that we can meet and don't ban chrome all together.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 13:25:29

No Duplicates.

Comment 49 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jerry

Last Name: Desmond

Email Address: jerry@desmondlobbyfirm.com

Affiliation: Desmond & Desmond LLC

Subject: CARB CrVI ATCM Update

Comment:

Comments of the Metal Finishing Association of Northern California, Metal Finishing Association of Southern California, and National Association for Surface Finishing.

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/56-chromeatcm2023-VjUGYQNwBDVXDglq.pdf>'

Original File Name: CARB CrVI ATCM Letter 1-16-23.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 14:56:06

No Duplicates.

Comment 50 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: CARLO

Last Name: SPARTANO

Email Address: CSPARTANO@COMPLETECOACH.COM

Affiliation: complete coach works

Subject: WE NEED CHROME PLATING

Comment:

THE AMOUNT OF ACTUAL HEX CHROME USED ON OUR PRODUCT LINE IS MINIMAL BUT NECARRY .THE SMALL AMOUNT OF CHROME IS NOT CAUSING HARM TO OUR ENVIRRONMENT LIKE DIESEL FUEL AIRCRAFT FUEL CONCRETE GRINDING AND CUTTING --WE NNEED CHROME PLATING

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 15:28:21

No Duplicates.

Comment 51 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Cathy

Last Name: Atterman

Email Address: la_design@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: CARB

Comment:

We have been in the promotional marketing industry as a supplier and manufacturer for more than 25 yrs. We have made plenty of jewelry and other small promotional items doing business with General/Brite Plating in LA County.

The amount of Chrome/Hexavalent Chrome use on these products does not represent enough of a percentage to cause any harm airborne or in contact to skin to warrant a ban. There have been enough props and other guidelines placed in this industry that are being followed to protect the people. I have never had a complaint from a client regarding this type of plating. There are very few plating companies left for manufacturers to source out for plating processes, please don't take away more jobs and more small business. There are other more important airborne causing illness like aircraft fuel, diesel fuel to name a couple.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 15:29:35

No Duplicates.

Comment 52 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Janice

Last Name: Stewart

Email Address: janice@henrispecialties.com

Affiliation:

Subject: ALLOW Chromium Electroplating and Acid Anodizing Operations

Comment:

This will kill a lot of our business as many hotels want special finishes and this is the only way to give them what they designed and want. We will have to go to China to get this done so there goes more work overseas instead of our own state! SMALL BUSINESS WILL LOSE OUT!!!

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 15:47:52

No Duplicates.

Comment 53 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Angelica

Last Name: Vargas

Email Address: Angelicavrda@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Keep Chrome in California

Comment:

Hello my name is Angelica Vargas,
I'm writing this petition to aid in the support to keep the chrome Industry. My husband has been an employee of Sherms Custom Plating for 20 plus years along with 12 others who are Fathers, Husbands, Grandfathers and the main household providers for their families. My husband has been able to give it his all, working long hours in something that not only makes a living doing but also is his passion. This career has given us a future to continue to own our own home, send our children to college and continue to live in the state of California. Thank you

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 17:22:07

No Duplicates.

Comment 54 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: David

Last Name: Martinez

Email Address: Davidamartinez77@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Chrome plating

Comment:

I have never seen a more regulated industry than that of the plating industry. And it's not just for the automotive industry. It's also for the art industry and home decor industry. Banning this type of industry is just going to drive out more of the fleeing citizens out of California. And another historical industry gone.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 18:03:26

No Duplicates.

Comment 55 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Randall
Last Name: Eldridge
Email Address: randy@ldlgc.com
Affiliation: General Contracting

Subject: User of Chrome Plated Products- Do Not Ban
Comment:

Please sirs, I urge you to consider how much actual base materials are used for this type of plating--not much. I would ask that you turn to look and spend more time and resources on larger use products/particulates that are harmful but in large scale such are diesel fuel waste, spills and mishandling and also dust particulate in out air from concrete cutting etc.

Thank you in advance,
Randall Eldridge

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 18:17:02

No Duplicates.

Comment 56 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Chris

Last Name: Scarano

Email Address: chris@leferforge.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please

Comment:

Please consider that the amount of actual Hex chrome used on our product line is minimal but necessary. The small amount of chrome is not causing harm to our environment like diesel fuel, aircraft fuel and Concrete cutting and grinding. Thank you!

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 19:32:01

No Duplicates.

Comment 57 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Source Test Frequency

Comment:

The requirement to source test pollution control systems very two years is unnecessary and extremely costly. It is unnecessary because ongoing compliance with Rule 1469 requires ongoing monitoring of control system parameters such as pressure drops and slot velocities and documented maintenance practices. District enforcement of these rule elements assures there is not a need for source testing frequency greater than every ten years. CARB's requirement to test every two years is unreasonable.

If there is data that supports the need for testing frequency less than 10 years, CARB should present it. Even the current SC AQMD requirement is too frequent.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 07:52:12

No Duplicates.

Comment 58 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Rebecca
Last Name: Overmyer-Velazquez
Email Address: rebecca@cleanaircoalition.org
Affiliation: Clean Air Coalition of North Whittier an

Subject: Switch to trivalent chromium!

Comment:

I ask that you finally take action to end the practice of boiling highly toxic metals near the places our children attend school, near our churches, near our local business, and next to the neighborhoods where we live, work, play, and pray. Over half the chrome platers in California are near a school, church, or neighborhood.

Switching to trivalent chromium has the benefit of not only significantly reducing the toxic emissions of one of the most dangerous chemicals known into our communities, but facilities using trivalent chromium avoid having to use toxic PFAS-based fume suppressants as well.

Please take this important action in the Chrome Plating ATCM now, to gain early reductions in the many communities affected by the decorative chrome platers, and to commit to early action to switch both the anodizer and hard chrome platers away from hexavalent chromium as soon as feasible alternatives can be identified.

Thank you for your commitment to protecting the health and well-being of our most impacted communities and your continued public service.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 08:32:29

No Duplicates.

Comment 59 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: James

Last Name: Simonelli

Email Address: james@metalscoalition.com

Affiliation: California Metals Coalition

Subject: Comments on ATCM (California Metals Coalition)

Comment:

Thank you for allowing us to provide comments. James

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/66-chromeatcm2023-R3VdKwNwBDhWMm0D.pdf>'

Original File Name: CMC_Comments_Jan2023_CARB_ATCM_Cr6.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 11:36:14

No Duplicates.

Comment 60 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Evette

Last Name: Holman

Email Address: evettebeckwith@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Chrome

Comment:

I am married to a decorative chrome plater here in California and I don't understand why CARB is unwilling to work with this industry. The regulations are stricter here than any other state. My husband runs a very clean operation in Sacramento, and it is monitored from multiple agencies to protect workers and public health.

How are we going to support ourselves not to mention his employees? You can't just move a Chrome plating shop, it takes lots of assets which quite frankly are not available. I would also question if what you are proposing is even legal? how you can ban the smallest users of chrome while allowing larger companies to operate seems unfair. Please reevaluate this rule before it does more damage to jobs in California.

Thank you

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-16 14:01:45

No Duplicates.

Comment 61 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: James

Last Name: Pessy

Email Address: artdecod@aol.com

Affiliation: Art Deco Decor inc

Subject: Chrome Plating

Comment:

Please Note ; We need Chrome plating for a lot of the Lighting Fixtures that we manufacture now and in the future . I understand that there is very little of Chrome actually used . There are lots of other chemicals other companies that are much worse for the environment .

By James Pessy

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 11:59:56

No Duplicates.

Comment 62 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Carl

Last Name: Troncale

Email Address: carl@caltronplating.com

Affiliation:

Subject: hex chrome

Comment:

To: CARB

I'm writing to share my opinion regarding the hexavalent chrome ban. Trivalent chrome does not have all the same properties as hex chrome. Color is one. The sulfate process has a better color, but you don't get the corrosion protection. the chloride process can resemble stainless steel in color. It is very important to our customer base that the color is right. We will lose customers. They will go to Az, Texas and Mexico first. I've already had the conversation with several of them.

I too wanting to protect the environment like everyone else, but this doesn't make sense to me. It seems to me that all were doing is exporting the process to another state or country. We have spent over \$100,00 dollars to control our emissions here and were a small company. I did not mind doing that and it really made a difference. Our Chrome emissions with the use of a Hepa filter are extremely low. I truly believe we will lose half if not more of our customers if this happens. We have been in business 62 years with many employees that have been here 35 to 50 years. Everyone has been health too.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carl Troncale, President

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 12:29:44

No Duplicates.

Comment 63 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Ray

Last Name: Lucas

Email Address: ray@valleychrome.com

Affiliation: MFANC

Subject: Hex Chrome Ban

Comment:

Ladies and gentlemen,

There is no good reason to destroy an industry when you have the alternative in rule 1469. I have already switched to Trivalent Chromium for my processes but it took years and hundreds of thousands of dollars. It does work in my case but anyone doing custom restoration work cannot use it. Since our industry contributes far less than 1 % of the emissions in California this rule makes no sense. I think you are kowtowing to the environmental coalitions for no good reason other than it is politically correct. Please do the right thing and change this from a ban to a rule that mirrors Southern Cal rule 1469. Don't kill off this vital industry for no good reason.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 13:11:36

No Duplicates.

Comment 64 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Albert

Last Name: Ybarra Sr.

Email Address: aychrome66@yahoo.com

Affiliation: Sherms Custom Plating

Subject: Ban on Hex Chrome

Comment:

My name is Albert Ybarra. I work for Sherm's Custom Plating in Sacramento. I have been in the chrome plating field for 38 years. I love my job. I have a family and grand kids who depending on me. If you decided to close the plating industry down you will be taking a lot of peoples jobs. Please do a little bit more study and research before you try to close down the industry.

Sincerely,

Albert Ybarra Sr.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 13:24:49

No Duplicates.

Comment 65 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Dustin

Last Name: Berry

Email Address: dberry@teikuro.com

Affiliation: Teikuro Corp.

Subject: Chrome plating

Comment:

Chrome plating is an essential part of manufacturing. Without the benefits of chrome plating and many other "toxic" surface coatings there are a multitude of products whose life would be significantly reduced. The impact of which would have an unmeasurable effect on the environment. The production of raw materials used in the manufacturing of everyday items and the tooling used to make these items would increase dramatically. The idea of banning chrome plating to improve on air quality or for other environmental reasons is completely backwards. Before making such drastic decisions we should look at the direct and indirect consequences they will have. There are far too many industries that rely on surface coatings like chrome plating.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 12:53:36

No Duplicates.

Comment 66 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Cynthia
Last Name: Babich
Email Address: delamoactioncommittee@gmail.com
Affiliation: Del Amo Action Committee

Subject: Hex Chrome Rule
Comment:

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/73-chromeatcm2023-WzhWMVUmADELZVcy.pdf>'

Original File Name: CARBHexChromeRule12023.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 14:03:52

No Duplicates.

Comment 67 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Unemployment is unhealthy and is a Social Justice issue

Comment:

Closing chrome facilities to move them out of state will cause worse health outcomes due to unemployment than chrome plating causes.

See:

Centers for Disease Control. NIOSH Study Examines Relationship between Employment Status, Healthcare Access, and Health Outcomes
<https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/updates/upd-11-18-21.html#:~:text=%E2%80%9CEmployment%20is%20a%20social%20determinant,health%20outcomes%2C%E2%80%9D%20said%20Silver.>

National Institute of Health. Job Loss and Health in the U.S. Labor Market
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2831278/>

There is a link between job loss, alcoholism, drug abuse, and homelessness. It impacts people in every community but particularly social justice communities. This CARB rulemaking will worsen conditions in the communities CARB is trying to help.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 14:03:19

No Duplicates.

Comment 68 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Melissa
Last Name: Lopez
Email Address: melissal@royalcustomdesigns.com
Affiliation: ROYAL CUSTOM DESIGNS

Subject: Chrome Plating
Comment:

CARB please consider that the amount of actual Hex chrome used on your product line is minimal but necessary. Mention that the small amount of chrome is not causing harm to our environment like diesel fuel, aircraft fuel and Concrete cutting and grinding.
We need Chrome Plating

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 14:22:45

No Duplicates.

Comment 69 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Restriction of Permits

Comment:

My public comments about "ban"s should also be read in the context that any restriction of new and/or changes to permits is equivalent to a "ban".

Changes to hex chrome plating processes made by authorities in the context of FAA approved repairs (e.g...DER, CMM, OHM, AMS, SOPM, etc..) which require the establishment of new tanks, or changes to existing tank chemistries, temperatures, and methods should not be dis-allowed by CARB when the facility has the appropriate controls in place or agrees to put them in place concurrent with the new or changed process. This is an Air Safety issue under the purview of the US Department of Transportation.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 15:24:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 70 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jimena

Last Name: Diaz Leiva

Email Address: jimena@ceh.org

Affiliation: Center for Environmental Health

Subject: re. Proposed Amendments to ATCM for Chromium Plating
Comment:

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/77-chromeatcm2023-BWZcO1UmBzYGXwZl.pdf>'

Original File Name: CARB Comment Letter Hex Chrome 01_17.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 16:22:40

No Duplicates.

Comment 71 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Anna

Last Name: Byrd

Email Address: anna.osr@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Support chrome plating

Comment:

All,

Recently, the California Air Resources Board proposed new regulations regarding the use of chromium plating in the metal finishing industry. In addition to their already strict environmental ordinances, these new guidelines will phase out hard chrome and chromic acid anodizing in the state of California.

According to the President of the Metal Finishing Associations of Southern California, these regulations will likely cause a severe decline in the California metal finishing industry. They will also require industrial producers to seek chrome plating services out of state. Aerospace and defense, the industrial, medical, automotive, and many other essential industries rely on the chromium plating process. We cant afford to lose industry in California and necessary chrome plating processes cant be replaced. I ask CARB to find the middle ground with the industry

In late April, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) proposed the following deadlines for the implementation of new regulations regarding hexavalent chromium plating:

Dec. 21, 2021 - A halt on the development of any new chromic acid anodizing or hexavalent hard or decorative chromium electroplating facilities

Jan. 1, 2023 - Final date for all existing decorative hexavalent chromium electroplating to transition to trivalent chromium

Jan. 1, 2027 - Final date for all existing hard hexavalent chromium to transition to trivalent chromium plating

Jan. 1, 2032 - Effective date for the ban of all existing chromic acid anodizing

In order to better understand hexavalent chromium emission sources, the CARB will be conducting site visits, facility-specific surveys, emissions source testing, and ambient monitoring in and around existing plating facilities. This data collection will then serve to prioritize emissions reduction strategies.

While decorative applications will be the first affected by the new regulations, functional applications are next. Many customers will not be open to the use of alternative methods. As of now, there is no indication that hard chrome and chromic acid anodizing are replaceable processes.

Chrome plating is a process used in aerospace, defense, and many

other industries to improve metal parts. It offers many beneficial properties that are valuable to these industries. For example, aviation manufacturers use chrome plating to improve the atmospheric corrosion resistance of metal parts and prevent dangerous, mid-op failures of critical equipment. Chrome plating also:

Reduces friction, Improves durability, Reduces seizing & Resists oxidation and corrosion. In addition, chrome plating can be used as bulking material to restore the original dimensions of metal components without compromising their integrity. Please consider this in your decisions. Thanks

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 16:45:36

No Duplicates.

Comment 72 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Wesley

Last Name: Turnbow

Email Address: wturnbow@emeplating.com

Affiliation: EME, Inc.

Subject: Pollution Controls Work! They stop hexavalent chrome in its tracks.

Comment:

Hello CARB Members:

I wanted to send you proof of the effectiveness of source controls when it comes to hexavalent chromium emissions. I have attached the Excel version to make it easy for your team to check formulas.

The South Coast AQMD monitored our facility fence line to fence line for 9 months. The attached data was pulled from their website. The fence line monitors were within 20 feet of our buildings, and our chromic acid anodize tank and spray booths were directly in between, as the prevailing winds blow. And the winds off of the ocean are fairly predictable. EME, Inc. was one of the first, if not the first, to place pollution controls on our chromic acid tank. That tank and the paint booths are fitted with HEPA filtration.

Note that the difference between the monitors is 0.00 nanograms when the one significantly test result is thrown out (it is less than a quarter of a nanogram even with that anomaly). The fact that there are low amounts of hexavalent chromium in the monitors at most times is because the Alameda Train Corridor and Alameda Ave (a large thoroughfare) are just downwind from our facility.

Bans are not the way to go! When it comes to hexavalent chromium, source controls have done the job effectively for years.

Best regards,

Wesley Turnbow
E. M. E., Inc.
431 E. Oaks Street
Compton, CA 90221
(323) 717-7871 mobile

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/79-chromeatcm2023-AGVROgdjWVUFa1cy.pdf>'

Original File Name: EME Hexavalent Chromium Monitoring 2017-2018.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 16:57:35

No Duplicates.

Comment 73 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: A question for the CARB Board

Comment:

Considering that CARB is expert in pollution control methods and chrome platers are experts in chrome plating, how is it possible for CARB to imagine that a replacement technology for hard hexavalent chrome plating will emerge by 2039 , but CARB is not able to imagine an improvement in hex chrome pollution control methods over the same period? Only a ban will suffice.

By virtue of this non-emission based proposal, CARB has explicitly assumed that they will make no improvements in pollution control methods for the next 16 years. If I was a member of CARB staff focused on improving pollution control methods, I would find this very de-motivating. If I was granting budget to CARB to make improvements in pollution control methods, I would slash the budget. But, what will the CARB Board do?

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 19:16:17

No Duplicates.

Comment 74 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Next Up? The 99%

Comment:

Imagine that the CARB Board approves this non-emission based ATCM. The EJ's can run a victory lap and 1% of the hex chrome problem will be solved in 2039. But what about the 99% of hex chrome emitters still out there. CARB will now be in a position wherein they have discredited the best available control technologies for dealing with Hex Chrome. HEPA filtration isn't adequate anymore and since 99% of the problem is still there, the EJ's won't be satisfied (unless this was just an isolated witch hunt). The EJ's will demand action and eventually, CARB will need to acknowledge that hex chrome emission do come from the manufacture, use of, and destruction of cement and concrete; that the working of stainless steels including welding and machining cause hex chrome emissions; that even electric vehicles need brakes. What then CARB? You will need a list of imagined replacement technologies to use as excuses for banning cement, stainless steel, and coatings. Is that even achievable? There are practical people and independent thinkers in your organization, they know the reality of the world we live in and while we would all like things to be better, we must focus on the things that are achievable if we are to make progress. We are not going to stop construction of buildings, roads, and vehicles and CARB will not have the political power to ban them. The only alternative is to eventually be honest with the EJ's and show them that the numbers and science don't support the fear that has been created. That the politicians who benefit from the fears are manipulators. That other risks are far more powerful in our lives. If CARB can't be honest, you will no longer be a science focused organization. Perceptions of CARB will continue the shift from being science based to being politics based. Is that what CARB wants?

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 19:22:25

No Duplicates.

Comment 75 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Local vs Statewide

Comment:

According to the health risk data published with this rule proposal, proximity is a major factor in risk. The EJ's say there are local problems in some Southern California communities. They are asking for solutions. CARB's proposal completely misses the local nature of the stated problems and imposes a non-local statewide rule and a statewide ban. Make the whole class stay in for recess when Jeff doesn't get his homework done. This is completely opposite the intent of AB 617 which asks CARB to place emphasis on the needs of local communities. I don't get it.

There is no relief from the ban granted to platers in communities with no residents. There is no relief granted to platers who are not near schools. It is especially curious that there is no provision to allow new permits in areas away from EJ communities and residents so that the platers the EJ community wants out, would have an in-state alternative place to go. A win-win. CARB is not providing a reasonable method for well-intentioned, law-abiding businesses to exist. Why?

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 19:35:24

No Duplicates.

Comment 76 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Hyman

Email Address: mark.hyman@alliance-finishing.com

Affiliation: Alliance Finishing & Mfg

Subject: Public Comment

Comment:

Dear Board Members,

Your proposed banning of Hex Chrome by 2025 is ill founded based upon complete ignorance of the sources and the quantities of chrome associated with those sources. Platers have complied many times over with proper science of filtration, wastewater treatment, worker training and PPE to make sure that both the employees and the public are properly protected. The amount of chrome emissions is minor (less than 3 Lbs) compared to volumnes of pollutants emitted by diesel combustion, the cutting of concrete, or chrome emissions associated with aviation fuels. The services that the chrome platers provided, be it decorative or functional coatings allow a multitude of industries to meet their engineering and/or aesthetic requirements at a cost that allow jobs to be maintained in California and provides a standard of living to for those respective industries and their employees. I realize that business do not vote, people do and a polkitical body MUST apply and listen to science rather than hysteria, rhetoric, and biases. If not, we the people would still think that the Earth is flat and the planets revolve around the Earth instead of the sun as the Catholic church promulgated in the face of Copernicus's theories. Please do not make the same mistake in legislating out the minor chrome emissions of plating industry and at the same time by turning a blind political eye away from the larger chrome emitting sources because the political and economic fallout from those sources will be a much longer and arduous legal fight by well funded, politically connected industries. It's much easier to attack the smaller industry because political bodies need a scapegoat to continue to prove to its constituents that they are doing right for them. However, when politics negates the science that shows which industries are the larger polluters in favor of going after the low hanging fruit (e.g. Platers) to "show progress." Let's all be thankful that we all know that the Earth is NOT flat, and that the truth of science continues to prove time and time again that political agenda quite often wants us think otherwise. This is exactly what's going on by NOT legislating significant reductions in the chrome emissions of the larger sources, that would much better protect the health of us all, Going after the plating industry will have no appreciable benefit of improvement in our health and the science continues to prove it over and over. Thank you, Mark Hyman, PhD

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 18:59:24

No Duplicates.

Comment 77 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Is this really about PFAS/PFOS?

Comment:

There are California chrome platers who have never used PFAS/PFOS fume suppressants.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 19:40:58

No Duplicates.

Comment 78 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Lanes

Email Address: stayinlanes@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Necessity for Chromium Playing

Comment:

Chromium plating is necessary for the defence of the United States of America. There are currently no substitutes for this technology. The best and most responsible place on the planet earth is to plate Chromium is the state of California where the regulations are the most strict. Preventing Chromium plating in California will lead to greater pollution and impact on the environment by moving the process to countries and locations that will be subject to less regulation and responsible service providers.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 20:05:48

No Duplicates.

Comment 79 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Brad

Last Name: Kerr

Email Address: brad@mileschemical.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Demise of Chromium Electroplating

Comment:

To whom it concerns....There is no good reason to destroy an industry when you have an alternative in rule 1469. If CARBS alternative is implemented the repercussion can affect many jobs in California and the beginning of the end to the aerospace industry in Southern California.

Having been in this industry for nearly forty years I have seen the worst and best of chrome electroplating. Honestly I can say the worst is behind us with restrictions and controls that were warranted, but that change began many years ago. Today our industry is tightly regulated, to the point chromic acid omissions have a negligible impact on our air quality or our environment in general. Lack of documentation of detrimental affects of hexavalent chromium with the restrictions in place today is really alarming. It is to the point of overkill and the impact can be substantial.

The demise of decorative hexavalent chrome plating will impact our manufacturing industry and actually create other forms of pollution. Just consider the cost of companies to send parts across our border to other States and Mexico. The pollution created to transport the parts is likely worse. Consider the cost to companies that will have to relocate for surely they won't be able to compete with sending parts out of our state.

Then you attach the Aerospace industry which is the heart of SoCal manufacturing. Chromic anodize, hard chrome plating are critical to this industry. It will drive these companies out of our state to areas that would welcome our jobs. Even if the technology existed the aerospace industry literally takes decades to approve and change process. But again why put our industry through so much anxiety when there isn't documentation that todays standards actually are detrimental to our environment. Save jobs and truly understand that ruling against hexavalent chromium electroplating is the beginning of over regulation that will force so many types of manufacturing out of our state or country.

Brad Kerr

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 22:33:13

No Duplicates.

Comment 80 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Ed

Last Name: Appleton

Email Address: edd@thechromeplace.com

Affiliation:

Subject: TRIVALENT CHROME IS NOT AN ALTERNATIVE – YET

Comment:

Granted, decorative trivalent chrome has improved over the years and may be suitable for some applications.

HOWEVER...

The motorcycle and automotive industry, in which we serve, is not only decorative but needs to be functional as well. The chrome plated finish needs to have both that beautiful appearance and also be able to withstand the effects of the environment.

The two types of trivalent chrome that are available do not provide the characteristics required for both the aesthetic and anti-corrosive properties in comparison to hexavalent chrome.

The trivalent chrome that looks closer to the hexavalent chrome does not have the anti-corrosive properties and durability while the other one that has better anti-corrosive properties but does not have the aesthetic appearance.

Neither one of these "alternatives" will serve our customer's needs...

Banning hexavalent chrome is not the answer !!!

- Customers and revenue will be driven to other states.
- Businesses, such as ours that strictly serves this clientele, will close and jobs will be lost.
- Banning hexavalent chrome in California will not protect the environment, it will actually increase the overall environmental damage due to looser environmental standards in other states.

There needs to be a balance...

The implementation of proven measures throughout California that have been established in cooperation between the agencies and industry, such as SCAQMD Rule 1469, would provide responsible stewardship of the environment, health standards and businesses.

Therefore, we do not need to eliminate an entire industry that provides beneficial products and services to many companies and consumers in addition to providing thousands of jobs within the State of California.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 22:44:22

No Duplicates.

Comment 81 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jane
Last Name: Williams
Email Address: Dcapjane@aol.com
Affiliation: California Communities Against Toxics

Subject: Chrome Platers
Comment:

Attachment: '<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/13-areaedes22-WmgGMFJhUzNWfQIy.docx>'

Original File Name: 2023-01 CARB Hex Chrome ATCM Letter copy.docx

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-17 16:39:39

No Duplicates.

Comment 1 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Florence

Last Name: Gharibian

Email Address: florencegharibian@yahoo.com

Affiliation: Del Amo Action Committee

Subject: Comments on Hexavalent Chrome Rule

Comment:

Comment uploaded by CARB Staff on behalf of Florence Gharibian.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/91-chromeatcm2023-UzBVMlwvBTQAbgl.pdf>

Original File Name: CARBHexChromeRule12023.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-26 08:52:03

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Charles

Last Name: Lozier

Email Address: cclklozier1@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Hex chrome

Comment:

Comment uploaded by CARB Staff on behalf of Charles Lozier.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/93-chromeatcm2023-Vj4HZFUsBAGLbglh.pdf>

Original File Name: Hex chrome.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-26 09:53:58

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Scott
Last Name: Henningsen
Email Address: hms.scotth@gmail.com
Affiliation: Henningsen Machine Shop

Subject: Hexavalent Chromium Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM)
Comment:

Comment uploaded by CARB Staff on behalf of Scott Henningsen.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/94-chromeatcm2023-Vj5QM1cuAzFVJQFg.pdf>

Original File Name: HexavalentChromiumATCM.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-26 11:48:51

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Jeff

Last Name: Hannapel

Email Address: jhannapel@thepolicygroup.com

Affiliation:

Subject: NASF Comments on Proposed Amendments to ATCM for Chromium Plating and Anodizing

Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/95-chromeatcm2023-AmxTNFYkU2YKU1U2.pdf>

Original File Name: NASF Comments on CARB Hex Chrome Rule January 2023.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 08:22:16

No Duplicates.

Comment 5 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Art

Last Name: Holman

Email Address: art@shermplating.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Comment

Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/98-chromeatcm2023-VTRUIAB1BD8BaANv.pdf>

Original File Name: artholman.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 08:33:32

No Duplicates.

Comment 6 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Bryan

Last Name: Leiker

Email Address: bleiker@klanodizing.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Comment

Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/99-chromeatcm2023-WzcGZVE5WWFSMQR2.pdf>

Original File Name: leiker.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 09:13:35

No Duplicates.

Comment 7 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Cal EnviroScore areas

Comment:

If an area is recognized in the CalEnviroScore database as not having residents and therefore has no score then hex chrome plating should not be banned or phased out in that area. Hex chrome plating is necessary and these types of areas are ideal for locating hex chrome businesses. Why send work out of state and to Mexico when there is an in-state alternative? Amend the proposed ATCM to carve out areas with no residential populations and allow hex chrome plating in those areas. It is necessary.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 09:52:21

No Duplicates.

Comment 8 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Keaton

Last Name: Curran

Email Address: Keaton.Curran@MacDermidEnthone.com

Affiliation: MacDermid Enthone - Global Chemical Supp

Subject: From a Global Supplier of Plating Solutions

Comment:

Hello to all it may address,

My name is Keaton Curran. I am a product management specialist for decorative finishes and plating on plastic at MacDermid Enthone, a global chemical supplier of plating solutions.

As a global supplier we share in the many woes and goals of regulators, OEMs, and our customers -the chrome applicators - that impact and guide this great industry. The goals and woes that we are here discussing today, the elimination of hexavalent chrome, is one we have listened to and made strides with at all levels of impact on this industry. Our teams around the globe have called upon and listened to applicators, OEMs, and regulating bodies to guide our product offerings and market direction well into the future. Today, we recognize and share with many across the industry the goal to offer sustainable solutions and meet our customer needs.

These sustainable alternatives technologies are growing and improved upon each and everyday as we commit to these goals but also these alternatives have carried many hurdles for the industry to adopt.

In the Decorative segment, a sustainable alternative solution we offer is Trivalent Chrome. Today, Trivalent Chrome with the newest generations can offer matching colors, new colors, leading corrosion resistance, and exceptional uniformity of deposits. But it's not as simple as pumping out hexavalent chrome tank, scrubbing down the line, and pumping in Trivalent Chrome. Applicators must adopt new equipment, train on new analyses, implement new maintenance techniques, finalize local and regional permits, test and market to current or new customers, and of course have the space available, time, and financial capital to complete the transition.

New technologies in Plating on Plastics eliminating Hexavalent Etchants from the Plating on Plastics segments are also growing acceptance into the industry. The fully Chrome-Free alternatives have taken foot largely due to Automotive OEM commitments to sustainability and expansion into new end use industries such as aerospace and electronics but these technologies too have high hurdles and high financial costs to implement. Many applicators in Plating on Plastics will be required to construct or rebuild up to

half of their existing manufacturing line to implement these alternatives technologies. This will incur vast costs, well above the presented estimates by CARB, for line construction, testing, implementation, permitting, and lost production time during installation.

OEMs and their Tier level customers share in these many hurdles as the risk to ensure retesting, re-PPAPing, and approvals are met without interrupting the delicate supply chain this Industry operates on.

Functional Hard Chrome applications eliminating hexavalent chrome are not in our opinion industrially available today and any viable technology are still years away. The development and adoption of such technology will require extensive time and resources to achieve a hexavalent chrome free industry.

As we step forward towards these goals and through the many hurdles our teams at MacDermid Enthone ask with great magnitude to ensure fully adequate funding and reasonable timeliness for applicators and their customers to step firmly into these alternative technologies.

Thank you for your time, and please accept our open hand of support, to everyone here today, to discuss any and all alternative technologies we offer.

Keaton Curran
Keaton.curran@macdermidenthone.com

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 09:46:44

No Duplicates.

Comment 9 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Brett

Last Name: Troncale

Email Address: brett@caltronplating.com

Affiliation: Cal-Tron Plating Inc.

Subject: Metal finishing

Comment:

I'm third generation in the plating business following my father and grandfather. This is what we know, this is what we have dedicated our life to. We follow all rules and regulations and will continue to. We would much rather be regulated then shut down. Please allow my son to be able to be 4th generation in this industry in beautiful California. Our family business supports over 160 employee family members that will be hurt by this. A Quote from one of our state inspectors "at least here I can walk in at any time and test admission and ensure regulations are followed, if banned in CA most companies will go to Mexico where it will not be regulated like it is here. It most likely will get much worst". We want to stay in business, we want to offer our services to all industries, we want to follow regulations, we want a safe California. We can work together and solve this without bans. Thank you.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 09:55:01

No Duplicates.

Comment 10 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Clayton

Last Name: James

Email Address: cfjames@rmking.com

Affiliation: King Industrial Hard Chrome

Subject: Hex Chrome Ban

Comment:

Hello my name is Clayton James and I am the facility manager of King Industrial Hard Chrome located in Fresno, CA. We are a small company with only 2 employees, but the work that these two employees process affects the whole world including you if you own anything made with cotton. That's what we do is manufacture and Chrome plate cotton picker spindles. We sell and ship these parts all over the world to be used in cotton pickers.

We utilize closed tanks with merlin covers and edd filters and our emissions are far lower than the current regulations require. The current regulations limit our emissions to be lower .015mg per amp hour. Our tanks actual emissions are 0.0000058 m/g per amp hour. Our facility total emissions for last year were 12.46mg our total limit allowed is 18,000mg. We choose to to keep our emissions low we take great pride in running a clean shop and keeping our employees safe. The only other companies that manufacture and hard Chrome plate cotton picker spindles are located in China.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 10:35:56

No Duplicates.

Comment 11 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Caroline

Last Name: O

Email Address: caroline.orija@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Chromium

Comment:

Many communities around California are overburdened by hexavalent chromium, as the slides shown today have demonstrated.

The use of these toxic chemicals can cause serious health problems for workers and local residents alike.

Switching to trivalent chromium has the benefit of not only significantly reducing the toxic emissions of one of the most dangerous chemicals known in our communities but facilities using trivalent chromium avoid having to use other toxic fume suppressants as well.

Respectfully I, urge the board to take this important action in the Chrome Plating ATCM now, to gain early reductions in the many communities affected by the decorative chrome platers.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 10:59:25

No Duplicates.

Comment 12 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Wesley

Last Name: Turnbow

Email Address: wturnbow@emeplating.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Comment

Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/106-chromeatcm2023-AnYFdIEiUWwHY1U6.pdf>

Original File Name: turnbow.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 11:04:16

No Duplicates.

Comment 13 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Jaime

Last Name: Lopez

Email Address: jaimeilo@usc.edu

Affiliation: University of Southern California

Subject: Ban Hex Chrome

Comment:

I am a resident in Paramount, CA and a doctoral candidate at the University of California focusing on environmental justice issues in Southeast Los Angeles. I hope everyone can acknowledge that there is gross imbalance between those in attendance being paid to advocate for industry and virtually all of the disadvantaged residents who live in the more than 100 environmental justice communities in CA who can't be here today. Many vulnerable community members do not have the capacity or awareness to yet fully understand the environmental harms that CARB is trying to protect them from, and they also may not have the luxury of an employer to pay for their attendance today.

Many statements made in support of industry fail to present arguments that indicate they've thought about environmental justice beyond their own self-serving perspectives and individual identifications such as, "I've been working at this company for x number of years", "I like my job" "I'm good at my job", "I'm x years old and still healthy and alive", etc. etc. It is clear from many of the statements today that environmental justice not understood within a larger societal context.

It is also tragic that employees are being paraded today on behalf of industry to downplay the harmful environmental conditions that environmental justice scholars and scientists have identified for decades.

Frontline communities are at the real victims here, and thank you CARB for standing up for those who can't speak for themselves today.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 11:49:54

No Duplicates.

Comment 14 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Amy

Last Name: Kyle

Email Address: amydkyle@berkeley.edu

Affiliation:

Subject: Comment

Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/108-chromeatcm2023-AGECaVEpUmoGeQNv.pdf>

Original File Name: amykyle.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 12:35:17

No Duplicates.

Comment 15 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Anthony

Last Name: Rendon

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Comment

Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/109-chromeatcm2023-AnFQNwFyWSRWIAnN.pdf>

Original File Name: sar.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-01-27 12:36:30

No Duplicates.

Comment 16 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Alan
Last Name: Olick
Email Address: alan@generalbrite.com
Affiliation: General Brite

Subject: Chrome Plating ATCM
Comment:

See attached for written comment submitted at the May 25, 2023, Board Hearing.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/446-chromeatcm2023-UjMFbwRkVWhXPlQ4.pdf>

Original File Name: AlanOlick.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-25 08:52:45

No Duplicates.

Comment 17 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: CARMEN
Last Name: CAMPBELL
Email Address: reception@anaplexcorp.com
Affiliation:

Subject: Ban of Hex chrome rule
Comment:

Dear Board,
On behalf of the employee owners in the city of Paramount we would like to request a true consideration on this rule based on actual science and not on the assumption and speculations that have no true data to back up the actual risks. AQMD worked tirelessly with the metal finishers to meet and lower any emissions deemed a high risk, with their work and education in the industry, we metal finishers have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars to maintain and lower our emissions to the community to nearly 0. We are the community! We are the economy that drives these communities considered disadvantaged. Thank you for your time and consideration. Let's work together and not alone in getting the environment better for all. Please remember this industry is ESSENTIAL!!

Regulate and not BAN!!!!

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-25 09:51:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 18 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Cynthia
Last Name: Babich
Email Address: delamoactioncommittee@gmail.com
Affiliation:

Subject: Adoption for Chrome Rule
Comment:

We support the long overdue adoption of a chrome rule that protects people. We urge you to also adopt strict monitoring as the phase out is implemented.

This rule will not only save lives but also enhances the quality of life around these facilities. Unfortunately it will not bring back the lives lost. Shinny bobbles should never outweigh community health and life.

Adopt TODAY
Director, Del Amo Action Committee
Coordinator of the Los Angeles Environmental Justice Network

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-25 10:29:40

No Duplicates.

Comment 19 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Bill

Last Name: Felts

Email Address: mjbchromeshop@yahoo.com

Affiliation: MJB Chrome Plating

Subject: Chrome Plating ATCM

Comment:

See attached for written comment submitted at the May 25, 2023, Board Hearing.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/449-chromeatcm2023-UjABblA9AD9VDFI0.pdf>

Original File Name: Bill Felts.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-25 10:33:12

No Duplicates.

Comment 20 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Yvonne

Last Name: Watson

Email Address: ywatson@dslextreme.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Chrome Plating Rule

Comment:

Dear Board,

Please strengthen the rules concerning Hex Chrome plating. In the event I'm not able to speak during today's meeting I wish to submit the following comments:

1) I'm disappointed that board has set the phase out for decorative chrome platers to 2030 when they could all switch to trivalent chromium now.

2) I believe that there remains serious exposures from the industry and we urge CARB to do more fenceline monitoring at chrome platers to ensure that the measures they relying on (Total Enclosure and Negative Air) are working to reduce emissions up until the phase out occurs.

3) CARB identified several chrome platers who were in current violation of their permits. The agency needs to work with the affected district to ensure that all chrome platers are in compliance with their existing permits. They should collaborate with the districts to do fenceline monitoring at facilities that are suspected of being out of compliance with their permits.

4) CARB should work with the DOD's Strategic Environmental Research Defense Program (SERDP) to investigate alternative metal coatings that can replace hexavalent chromium.

5) CARB should work with the attorney general on an enforcement initiative directed at the chrome plating industry and the damage they have done to the both the natural resources and public health of the state.

I have lived my entire life in California EJ communities affected by air toxics and contaminated water. I can no longer attend in person meetings due to being partially immunocompromised after 2 hospitalizations for lung failure in 2019.

I have severe, life-threatening asthma and have never smoked a day in my life.

Please protect public health for people like me!

Yvonne Martinez Watson

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-25 10:36:12

No Duplicates.

Comment 21 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023). (At Hearing)

First Name: Jesse N

Last Name: Marquez

Email Address: jnm4ej@yahoo.com

Affiliation: Coalition For A Safe Environment

Subject: LOS of New CARB ATCM Amendments & Additional Requests

Comment:

See attached LOS

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/451-chromeatcm2023-UDNWNgBgVHQHZAVa.pdf>

Original File Name: CFASE et al Letter of Support - 5-25-2023.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-25 10:52:23

No Duplicates.

Comment 1 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: New Error in Emission Inventory (Table 1 and Table 2 disagree)

Comment:

The previous appendix B Table 2 on Line 3 "Hard with Add-On" showed the computation of the average source test value used in Table 1 of Appendix B above it. The calculation included results from seven tested facilities. The values were:

As shown previously
Test 1 0.00045
Test 2 0.00011
Test 3 0.001
Test 4 0.00034
Test 5 0.00063
Test 6 0.0002875
Test 7 0.0013
Average 0.000588214

Now, I don't know if the facility source test values you used above are correct or not but I do know math and the math appears to be a correct computation of the average of the values shown.

In your now corrected emission inventory put out this morning, your team is using a value of 0.0000588214 as the source test value for hard chrome. I know that you know that 0.000588214 is a magnitude of 10 times greater than the 0.0000588214. So, what changed? Your team has not included a revised Table 2 with the data release from this morning. Therefore the 0.0000588214 is an unsupported value since it does not correspond to the yet to be corrected Table 2 of Appendix B. The official record supporting a hex chrome emission rule contains this critical 10X uncorrected error which is a building block of the current emissions of the industry.

I recommend CARB introduce a quality assurance function. Those of us who are in the aviation safety business (until 2039) have found value in having a second set of eyes inspect work before it goes out.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-03-29 08:08:26

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Hex Chrome Emissions in Paramount

Comment:

According to the March 27 modification of the Emissions Inventory, the STATEWIDE hex chrome emissions of the ENTIRE METAL FINISHING INDUSTRY in 2019 were 0.19 pounds. You can verify this by referring to attachment 2, page 22, lower right cell in the table.

It is helpful to contrast this with the hex chrome emissions reported in Paramount, California in 2017 from just two sources; Carlton Forge at 0.6 pounds and Press Forge at 0.3 pounds. That is just in Paramount. You can verify this yourself by going to CARB's website here

(https://www.arb.ca.gov/carbapps/pollution-map/?_ga=2.123164547.925282913.1680112885-1134180171.1680112885#) and using the pollution mapping tool CARB provides. Please use the filter criteria on the left and select pollutant = hexavalent chromium, City = Paramount, and Year = 2017.

Please keep this in mind when you hear CARB staff tell you fugitive emissions from metal finishers were the problem in Paramount. The emissions were observed from Metal Processors (See list here: <http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/eh/chromium6/directive.htm>) of which only two of the nine Metal Processors were Metal Finishers (Anaplex and Lubeco).

So, again, Carlton Forge and Press Forge reported emissions totalling 0.9 pounds just a few blocks from the metal finishers whose entire industry statewide emitted a fraction of that total. CARB is making no attempt to ban hex chrome emissions from Carlton Forge which is owned by Warren Buffet. But then, that might be a bit more difficult for CARB.

STOP THE BAN.

Please note that the modification of the Emissions Inventory enabled this public comment and it is therefore pertinent for inclusion in the board's considerations. I reserve the right to modify this comment if CARB staff amend the emissions inventory for a third time.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-03-29 15:20:39

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: JIM

Last Name: MEYER

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Proportionality of Metal Finishers to Metal Processors / Implications for Fugitives
Comment:

Since we now have a new total hex chrome emission number we can examine the proportionality between Metal Processors and Metal Finishers in Paramount. According to the March 27 modification of the Emissions Inventory, the STATEWIDE hex chrome emissions of the ENTIRE METAL FINISHING INDUSTRY in 2019 were 0.19 pounds. You can verify this by referring to attachment 2, page 22, lower right cell in the table.

It is helpful to contrast this with the hex chrome emissions reported in Paramount, California in 2017 from just two sources; Carlton Forge at 0.6 pounds and Press Forge at 0.3 pounds. That is just in Paramount. You can verify this yourself by going to CARB's website here

(https://www.arb.ca.gov/carbapps/pollution-map/?_ga=2.123164547.925282913.1680112885-1134180171.1680112885#) and using the pollution mapping tool CARB provides. Please use the filter criteria on the left and select pollutant = hexavalent chromium, City = Paramount, and Year = 2017.

Please keep this in mind when you hear CARB staff tell you fugitive emissions from metal finishers were the problem in Paramount. The emissions were observed from Metal Processors (See list here: <http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/eh/chromium6/directive.htm>) of which only two of the nine Metal Processors were Metal Finishers (Anaplex and Lubeco).

So, again, Carlton Forge and Press Forge reported emissions totalling 0.9 pounds just a few blocks from the metal finishers whose entire industry statewide emitted a fraction of that total. CARB is making no attempt to ban hex chrome emissions from Carlton Forge which is owned by Warren Buffet. But then, that might be a bit more difficult for CARB.

Please note that the modification of the Emissions Inventory enabled this public comment and it is therefore pertinent for inclusion in the board's considerations. I reserve the right to modify this comment if CARB staff amend the emissions inventory for a third time.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-03-30 06:16:15

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: WARNING - Compliance is not a success strategy in California

Comment:

CARB's March modification of the proposed new chrome plating rule failed to delete the ban. The message from CARB to business remains the same...

Businesses that adopt a compliance based strategy to do business in California are not safe. CARB will ban you anyway, and they will do it with full knowledge that the replacement technology for your process has not been invented yet. They will do it even if your site selection process selects a non-residential location. This warning is applicable to any business that works not only with chromium but also stainless steel.

Southern California has the strictest and most effective chrome plating rule in the world already (Rule 1469). Chrome plating firms in Southern California are already in compliance with Rule 1469 (if they are not, CARB and AQMD are not effectively enforcing existing regulations). CARB's proposed ATCM continues to impose a ban on these compliant businesses. They cannot grow and they will be eliminated with no alternative paths to comply.

Heed this warning if you are considering investment in California. Compliance will not save you.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-03-31 06:25:45

No Duplicates.

Comment 5 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Cancer Risk Falsehood (Please Correct)

Comment:

The staff presentation to the Board on January 27 contained two slides which referred to a "213 in a million" cancer risk from chrome platers. The "213" value comes from Table F.14(b) in appendix F page 28. Table F.14(b) shows the cancer risk from large hard chrome facilities without controls, and maps the cancer risk using two variables, throughput, and proximity.

Considering there are ZERO facilities in California with throughput at 120,000,000, and likely ZERO hard chrome facilities operating without HEPA controls, and ZERO facilities of anywhere close to that size that are 5 meters from a residential source, CARB's allegation of a "213 in a million" cancer risk from chrome plating is a complete FALSEHOOD. Unfortunately, the LA Times picked it up and has published it as a general description of the cancer risk from large chrome facilities.

I challenge CARB to spend a few minutes and locate the facility that has the highest cancer risk in the state using Table F.14(b) (proximity and size) but also in consideration of the HEPA controls that facility operates with, and tell the public what the real truth is about the maximum cancer risk at the highest risk real chrome plating facility in California. The answer will not be 213 in a million.

This comment is not about any modifications to the rule that were published on March 27. It is about incorrect cancer risk contained in CARB materials presented to the board on January 27 and which influenced the board's feedback to the staff on that date. Page 24 of the presentation states "Controlled Tanks". Table F.14(b) contains information about uncontrolled tanks.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-03 14:18:10

No Duplicates.

Comment 6 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: SRIA Cost / Benefit Relationship no longer relevant

Comment:

The SRIA painted the picture that implementation of the proposed ATCM will provide an annual hex chrome emission reduction benefit of 10.15 pounds annually at a cost of \$688 Million. That works out to \$68 million per pound of hex chrome reduced.

Subsequent publishing of the ISOR in November of 2022 and now the revised emissions inventory in March of 2023 reveal that there are only 0.19 pounds of hex chrome actually emitted annually. So, this is a 53-fold reduction in the benefit for the same cost.

Let's assume for now, that CARB's March 27 emission inventory is correct and that the costs originally assumed in the SRIA have not changed. We can calculate the benefit at 0.19 pounds per year and the cost at \$688 million and determine that the cost of the ATCM is now \$3.621 Billion per pound of hex chrome reduced. Considering all the non-chrome plating sources and emissions which have not been addressed by CARB yet, California is looking at an absolutely crushing economic hit to come in the range of more than \$100 Billion.

How does the Department of Finance feel about this proposal now?

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-03 15:37:03

No Duplicates.

Comment 7 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Technology Reviews

Comment:

CARB has not defined what a technology review is. What is CARB's definition of a technology review? What criteria would be used to ascertain that an alternative technology is viable in terms of capability, reliability, market acceptance, economics, and environment? (not a comprehensive list of criteria).

Who would be the participants in a technology review? We can see who participated in the technology review which led to where we are on Page 230 of the ISOR. I suggest that reviews of materials and processes which keep transport aircraft airworthy should be weighted towards scientists and engineers. The LA Times published an article on Jan 27 in which an environmental and community justice advocate and attorney is quoted as saying "We would be working with the industry and the military to actually identify new coatings. That's precedent setting". Indeed it is.

CARB does not seem to realize that hexavalent chrome is used in a variety of chemical solutions to process parts constructed of a wide range of base materials and alloys (some ferrous and some non-ferrous) for a wide range of applications. There will not be a singular magic technology that will replace hex chrome across all applications at the same time. Change will occur incrementally process by process. Change will not occur facility type by facility type. CARB's references to technology reviews in the posted materials are little more than a punt. A dangerous punt if you rely on commercial aircraft for transportation.

CARB points to an apparent comment by Boeing that a 2039 phase-out date is OK with Boeing so long as there are technology reviews. Boeing has reason to be confident they can overwhelm CARB in a technology review, however, we have not seen any concurrence by Lockheed, Raytheon, Airbus, Parker, Honeywell, Northrup, DOD, the FAA or anyone else with the requisite technical expertise. Many of the supply chains supporting these entities have already left California.

At what point leading into 2039 will CARB relax the ban when a technological substitute is not found?

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-04 13:20:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 8 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: CARB has grossly misinformed the public

Comment:

Now that we can see the corrected emission inventory...

On page 37 of this presentation here
(https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-06/Chrome%20Public%20Workshop%206.9.22_9.30am.pdf)

CARB defined large functional platers as "hard chrome platers w/ Add-On Controls".

On page 38, they show that Large functional platers (defined above) have a cancer risk of 213 in a million.

In the posted appendix F, Table F.14(b) CARB shows that a cancer risk of 213 in a million is derived from a facility assumed to be 0 meters from a receptor with throughput of 120,000,000 amp hours and an emission rate at the ATCM limit of 0.0015. The emission rate of 0.0015 is not the emission rate of a facility with Add-On Controls. Large chrome platers in California have HEPA systems as required by the Air Districts. There is no such facility in California with 120,000,000 amp / hours located 0 meters from a residential receptor, without a HEPA system. Zero.

The highest risk facility has a throughput of 116,500,000, is located 40 meters from a residential receptor, and has a HEPA system. The HEPA system efficiency of that facility is unknown by this writer but CARB's posted materials contain two statements about HEPA control efficiency. Table 1 of the emission inventory states 0.0000588, and Table 2 of the emission inventory states 0.000588. Using these values, we can calculate that facility has a cancer risk between 6 in a million (Table 1 HEPA efficiency) or 60 in a million (Table 2 HEPA efficiency). (As an aside, yes it would be helpful if CARB would correct this previously identified discrepancy between the two HEPA efficiency numbers in their posted materials).

Page 39 of the presentation is highly inaccurate in several respects as we can now determine from review of the emission inventory just released by CARB. Yet this seems to be the basis for statements in the ISOR and SRIA and made to the board on January 27.

The presentation referenced above was made to a public workshop on June 9, 2022 and was (I am sure) troubling to the public and

environmental justice communities who viewed it. They were misinformed.

The advocates for this rule have been misinformed. The media have been misinformed. An industry has been damaged. Large chrome platters with HEPA controls have been damaged.

CARB. What is your response?

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-06 17:18:41

No Duplicates.

Comment 9 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: BobbiProposed

Last Name: Burns

Email Address: bobbiburns@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation: Global Plating Inc

Subject: Proposed Ban on Hex Chrome ATCM

Comment:

Contempt prior to investigation is the best way to summarize the latest revisions made to the proposed amendment to the ATCM. CARB's presentation from June 2022 stated that "Chrome Plating emissions account for less than 1%" in the State of California. The slides presented to the public showed our Industry responsible for 10 lbs annually of Hex Chrome. Now in March 2023, CARB has stated we are .19 percent and approximately 1 lb annually. The CARB Board and public have been mis-informed. Several journalists have published articles with the inaccurate data quoted directly from CARB's presentations. Our Industry has been prejudicially singled out and the proposed BAN renders our assets to CARB's favorite word "ZERO"

It is CARB Staff's opinion that there is no safe level therefore none of the proposed options to add more controls to achieve an even lower emission is worth discussing. This proposed BAN has been generated by an attempt to calm the emotional outcry of disadvantaged communities. Communities that are mostly affected by mobile sources of pollution that we all contend with. Communities that have been built around industrial areas due to poor city planning and greedy land developers.

I see my neighborhood over the last three years developing thousands of homes, not low-income housing, very expensive high rise type homes right in the center of the industrial area, between two freeways in Fremont, CA. This mixture is problematic and when government officials introduce flawed data, there is panic and outrage by all parties affected. I am embarrassed and disappointed that CARB has not removed the BAN from this proposed rule, mostly because CARB Staff knows the truth about the emissions in our Industry. The fact that CARB would use our Industry for a political glory is a shame. I urge CARB to keep this amendment an emission base rule, not a ban. Please do not abandoned decades progress in the road to lowering emissions by terminating an entire industry, an Industry that has invested in the ATCM and has proven there is a way to keep Chrome Plating in this State.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-07 12:33:22

No Duplicates.

Comment 10 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Art

Last Name: Holman

Email Address: art@shermsplating.com

Affiliation: Sherm's Custom Plating

Subject: Incorrect data

Comment:

The CARB board has a responsibility to hold staff accountable for accurate data to base this rule making process that will affect the lives of thousands of people here in the state and beyond. To date the emission rate data that's been shared have been flawed, therefor it is impossible for the board to make an educated decision on this very aggressive rule.

Using staff's table III.1 as an example, why are we even looking at estimated emission rates? Local air districts have actual reported amp hours and emission rates as required by law. CARB staff must input the correct data to comprise a true representative sample of industry emissions, only then would the board have the information required to make a decision that will impact so many lives.

The first working group meeting was held Sept. 11, 2020, and still we are being presented with flawed emission rate numbers. Initial data submitted by staff for this rule was the Chrome Plating Industry as a whole emitted 10.15 lbs. of hexavalent chrome annually. That information was shared with the public and created an outcry within communities and environmental groups. Now in the 15-day comment period, data is shared and emission rates are 0.19 lbs. annually, but the damage has already been done.

CARB Board members must hold staff accountable to provide accurate information regarding emission rates before a decision is made that will affect so many lives and jobs here in California. As a CEO of a company, you would require your staff to present accurate data for the basis of making a decision that will impact your business livelihood and that of your employees. Inaccuracies would not be tolerated, but CARB staff faces no consequences for reporting these inaccuracies or failing to provide requested information to stakeholders.

I urge the Board to delay this rulemaking process until such time as the true emission numbers have been calculated using accurate amp hrs. and source test emission rates as reported to local Air Districts.

Respectfully,
Art Holman

Sherm's Custom Plating

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-10 12:13:26

No Duplicates.

Comment 11 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Terence

Last Name: McGuinness

Email Address: terrym@allcleanhaz.com

Affiliation:

Subject: CHROME BAN IN CALIFORNIA

Comment:

Since the implementation of RCRA, which is the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976. I have provided Hazardous Waste Management services to the commercial, industrial, and military sectors of California since 1977.

I have the honor to sit on the Board for the National Association of Surface Finishers and the Metal Finishing Association of Northern California.

Over the last 46 years I have seen many changes in the continuing effort of our regulatory community to eliminate Industrial growth in the State of California.

This ban will immediately and negatively impact operations for many family-owned small businesses.

This ban will present decorative and functional Chrome 6 plating facilities with unreasonable choices.

- Close their operations immediately.
- Those costs will start at the low end of \$375,000.00 to over 1 million dollars, depending on the size of the facility.
- The current cost for disposal alone of a 1000 gal Chromic Acid Bath is \$7,500.00. This cost does not include the management of surrounding support equipment of the process.
- When a facility is forced to close, it will cause these hard working Americans to lose their jobs and their family's livelihoods.
- Or invest significant dollars over three years to comply with new CARB emission rules, and ultimately close their operations on the January 1, 2027 the proposed ban date.
- If a facility operator is not properly financially prepared for such an event, the cost will then need to be absorbed into the States Superfund budget. Another burden passed on to all our hard-working California Americans.
- Please don't think that this ban is going to stop Chrome Plating. it will simply just go underground with no environmental controls. This BAN is a painfully irresponsible idea, and your Staff should be embarrassed to have even brought this flawed data before the Board.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-10 12:27:55

No Duplicates.

Comment 12 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Aaron

Last Name: Plechaty

Email Address: aplechaty@electro-coatings.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Destroying an industry is not the answer ...

Comment:

The plating industry is asking and looking for cooperation in the overall picture of what you are looking at. From what I can tell, the ruling that is looking to take place is without all the data, and with the full scope of everything in play here. It seems, offhand, that to make a proper ruling you would want to collect all the data (I know the industry is providing a metric ton of it), to compile and fact check before you just toss your hat in the ring haphazardly. You are looking to destroy an industry that while they operate with chrome (they operate safely and within all parameters all agencies impose on them) makes up a whopping 1% of all Hex Chrome emissions in the entire state. 1%. Theme parks put out more emissions.

Please consider reviewing the emissions standards and rules, revising them to allow the thousands of individuals who have and continue put their entire lives work into the states economy vs just flipping a switch and shutting them all down without reviewing and working with these families you are playing with - without the full review needed - to force to shut down. We, the industry, work hard day in and day to meet or exceed the state emissions standards. Review them. Shutting these shops down may reduce a tiny bit of the emissions, but that work will go to the states with less restrictions and just amplify the nations emissions. There is middle ground, as stated above, review the emissions standards - work with the industry, not against it and see the future that we can create together.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-10 12:59:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 13 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Tracey

Last Name: Coss

Email Address: traceycoss@scpci.com

Affiliation:

Subject: ATCM for hex chrome

Comment:

I urge the California Air Resources Board [CARB] to NOT move forward with the proposed amendment to the Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations [CrVI ATCM], and instead to revise the ATCM to provide emission control measures that will be effective in further reducing the negligible amount of air emissions of hexavalent chromium from metal finishing facilities, recognize the extremely negative consequences of proposed bans, and provide a reasoned, science-based approach and emission-based rule moving forward.

The proposed ban on CrVI plating fails to acknowledge the importance of this segment of manufacturing in California, the significant emission reductions the industry has achieved to date and can obtain through further emission reduction efforts, and the increase in emissions (from commercial trucks transporting products for CrVI plating) that will result from plating operations moving to other states and countries with less, if any, emission requirements. Further, bans will leak significant businesses and associated jobs away from California!

CrVI plating facility emissions have been significantly reduced over the years to the extent that chrome metal finishing comprises significantly less than 1% of total annual CrVI emissions for the entire state. No other state or country has CrVI emission limits anywhere near the level of protections already established in California. CARB should acknowledge that protection of the environment is best achieved in California by working WITH industry.

I urge CARB to remove the ban, correct the data, SAVE JOBS, and prevent business from closing down and/or leaving the state.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-10 13:58:41

No Duplicates.

Comment 14 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: For the Record

Comment:

The attached was sent to CARB staff, Cliff and Chang, via USPS certified mail, return receipt requested and via email. A receipt was returned for the Chang letter. Cliff acknowledged by email that he had passed it to staff. This posting is to make the CARB board aware of it.

The materials posted in this 15 day period show that the largest and (according to CARB) the riskiest chrome platers in the state have cancer risks well below 10 in a million considering proximity and control system efficiency. Yet CARB is trumpeting to the public, to the EJ communities, and to the media that the cancer risk is 213 in a million.

Will the CARB board see through the deceptions? or will the CARB board tie itself to the CARB staff and join the deceptions?

CARB credibility is on the line. Quite honestly, it is noteworthy that this has been allowed to persist this far.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/128-chromeatcm2023-AGMBZl0uV2YEXVMw.pdf>

Original File Name: CARB Cliff 03062023.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-10 14:24:18

No Duplicates.

Comment 15 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Steve

Last Name: Oliveira

Email Address: info@bbcmachine.com

Affiliation:

Subject: proposed ban

Comment:

Our customers, our employees, our fellow platers urge CARB to reconsider the bans on decorative hexavalent chromium plating, hard hexavalent chromium plating, and chromic acid anodizing. The bans would provide little, if any, environmental benefits, will not decrease customer demands for hexavalent chromium plating and anodizing, will impose undue economic hardships on California plating shops, and will likely result in a net increase in hexavalent chromium emissions.

An emissions-based rule could continue the surface finishing industry's long-standing record to reduce hexavalent chromium emissions without imposing significant economic hardships on California plating companies and the communities that they serve with good paying jobs and financial contributions to local businesses.

We urge the committee to focus on the facts and overall impacts a decision to ban this industry in California will honestly have. An industry that has contributed to its success, been a loyal partner and provided many opportunities to its purveyors does not deserve to be cancelled based on incomplete or speculative data. A ban is not the answer in the overall goal of reducing emissions as it will just shift elsewhere.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-10 13:15:53

No Duplicates.

Comment 16 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Use of Hex Chrome REDUCES Ambient Hex Chrome

Comment:

Please refer to the attached photo of a Cal Fire S70 Helicopter which is maintained in flight worthy condition via the use of hexavalent chromium plating. This helicopter fights fires. The fires it extinguishes emit FAR more hexavalent chrome than the entire chrome plating industry in California.

Rules adopted by CARB will have consequences.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/131-chromeatcm2023-BmVTNAdqADUKZQR2.jpg>

Original File Name: CalFire S70.jpg

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-11 09:03:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 17 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Neil

Last Name: Hammel

Email Address: neil@vcapcd.org

Affiliation: Ventura County APCD

Subject: Correction to Surface Tension Calculation using Stalagmometer

Comment:

The listed surface tension of water at 25 degrees celcius (72.75 dynes/cm) in now appendix 7 is actually the surface tension of water at 20 degrees celcius. The correct surface tension of water at 25 degrees celcius is 71.99 dynes/cm as noted in the International Tables of the Surface Tension of Water at <https://srd.nist.gov/JPCRD/jpcrd231.pdf> and attached. If facilities use the surface tension calculation as presented in the ATCM, their results will be skewed higher than reality, resulting in greater emissions of hexchrome. Thank you.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/132-chromeatcm2023-UzpdNVciAjRRJQBu.pdf>

Original File Name: International Tables of the Surface Tension of Water.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-11 12:13:41

No Duplicates.

Comment 18 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jerry

Last Name: Desmond

Email Address: jerry@desmondlobbyfirm.com

Affiliation: MFASC-MFANC-NASF

Subject: Chromeatcm2023

Comment:

Attached please find the comments of the the Metal Finishing Association of Southern California [MFASC], Metal Finishing Association of Northern California [MFANC] and National Association of Surface Finishers [NASF] regarding the March 27 Notice of Public Availability of Modified Text and Availability of Additional Documents and Information on the Proposed Amendments to the Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations [ATCM].

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/133-chromeatcm2023-VDcAZwBzV2YHXlc0.pdf>

Original File Name: CARB CrVI ATCM Letter 4-11-23.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-11 13:02:46

No Duplicates.

Comment 19 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: James

Last Name: Simonelli

Email Address: james@metalscoalition.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Comments on ATCM (California Metals Coalition)

Comment:

Please see enclosed comments. Thank you.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/134-chromeatcm2023-WzgAawFjWVVSNwZp.pdf>

Original File Name: CMC_Comments_April11-2023_CARB_ATCM.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-11 14:17:43

No Duplicates.

Comment 20 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Charles

Last Name: Pomeroy

Email Address: cpomeroy@stilesomeroy.com

Affiliation: StilesPomeroy LLP

Subject: Letter to CARB Re Chrome Platers Proposed ATCM w Attachments
Comment:

Please see attached communication.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/135-chromeatcm2023-AF9UYFFjAn8CMAgm.pdf>

Original File Name: (23.4.11) Letter to CARB Re Chrome Platers Proposed ATCM w Att.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-11 16:27:53

No Duplicates.

Comment 21 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: Jerry

Last Name: Desmond

Email Address: Jerry@desmondlobbyfirm.com

Affiliation: MFASC-MFANC-NASF

Subject: Chromeatcm2023

Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/136-chromeatcm2023-UTIAZwNwAzJXDgNg.pdf>

Original File Name: CARB CrVI ATCM Letter Enc 2-10-23 web.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-11 16:54:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 22 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-1.

First Name: James

Last Name: Goehring

Email Address: jrgjrgus@outlook.com

Affiliation: Manager

Subject: Proposed ATCM amendments

Comment:

During the public hearing in January CARB heard from many smart people who have worked with and around Cr6 for decades with no problem. I implore the Board to listen to their voices and make use of their expertise. The risk is manageable and as a regulatory agency that is CARB's job; to manage and not propose bans for political purposes. Please do what's best for the majority of Californian's and not what would benefit only the wishes of a small special interest group. Please reject the proposed regulations.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-11 17:19:24

No Duplicates.

Comment 1 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Ted

Last Name: Ventresca

Email Address: tventresca@chemeon.com

Affiliation: CHEMEON Surface Technology / MFACA

Subject: Amendment to ATCM

Comment:

By Ted Ventresca President/COO CHEMEON Surface Technology

Due to time limitation for in person comments at the January 27th meeting, CHEMEON representative, Mr. Frank Aguilar was unable to present the following on behalf of CHEMEON.

CHEMEON is a proud member of the Metal Finishing Association of California and is regarded as a global expert in the alternative chemistries used to replace hexavalent chrome as a conversion coating on light metals and as a replacement for sodium dichromate/dilute chrome as an anodic seal. Our company mission and vision align with the CARB goal to reduce and ultimately remove the known carcinogen, hexavalent chrome.

Over the past year, we have followed the Proposed Amendments to the ATCM by CARB. We agree with the Metal Finishing Association that the recommendations and proposals put forth by CARB will have a severe impact on the metal finishing industry, the communities, people, and businesses of the state who rely on the essential work being done by the metal finishing industry, and unfortunately, it would not achieve your admirable goal regarding the reduction and ultimate removal of hexavalent chrome.

To truly rid California, the U.S., and the world of continued use of hexavalent chrome, the root cause of usage must first be addressed. And, to be clear, the Metal Finishing Industry of California is not the root cause.

The root cause of the continued use of hexavalent chrome for plating, finishing, conversion coating, and anodic seals is a direct result of legacy specifications that, for over 70 years, have required the use of hexavalent chrome by the manufacturers of these parts and products, including many of those used by the U.S. military and the Department of Defense.

Until specifications allow for safer alternatives or remove hexavalent chrome from the specification completely, the chemistry will still be used.

Why have some OEMs been slower to change specifications that still require the use of hex chrome on certain metal parts? Possibly due to their internal legacy systems and -- in some cases -- legacy

safety standards that may need extensive new testing and validation to deviate or change from legacy chemistry. Certainly, the state and federal governments understand the time involved in changing, modifying, or moving away from legacy or outdated procedures.

When CARB and other state and federal agencies address the root cause of the issue, change becomes possible, and solutions become clear.

In recent years, the DoD and the automotive industry have made great strides in the elimination of hexavalent chrome use at military bases, depots, and commercial vehicle production. We know this firsthand because CHEMEON products have provided some of the safer alternative solutions. Through collaboration with OEM's Prime Contractors -- and the DOD directly -- we have identified and developed military-specified alternative chemicals and process solutions to legacy hex chrome specifications. Hex chrome usage has been significantly reduced by the DoD.

How can CARB address the root cause of hexavalent chrome without the harm to the state economy and Metal Finishing Industry of California?

We ask you to consider the following steps for CARB to implement in an effort to truly help end the use of hex chrome for California and the world:

1. In the next six months, CARB and SCQAMD researchers will work with industry and metal finishers to identify all part specifications or industry coating standards that still call for the use of hexavalent chrome.
2. Take that information and begin collaborative work between the OEM and Prime Contractors, safe chemical solution providers, and metal finishing and process shops in a unified effort to test, validate, and amend the specifications or to allow process shops in California and across the U.S the ability for a "deviation" from the hex chrome specification to alternate safe chemistries like CHEMEON and other Tier 1 chemical manufacturers have created and are available right now.
3. CARB and SCQAMD may consider routing the funds slotted to enforce your proposed updates to the ATCM instead to support and incentivize collaborations between industry, safer chemical manufacturers, and process facilities to accelerate their work to identify, test, and implement existing alternatives to hexavalent chrome.
4. Work with the U.S. EPA and other federal agencies to require the elimination of hexavalent chromium at the root cause: the manufacturers who continue to require that this product be used instead of the alternatives that are already on the market.

This approach will not only save jobs, but it will ultimately save lives and the California economy.

Please consider CHEMEON a resource in helping you implement positive chemical and business solutions that protect the environment, communities, and jobs related to the Metal Finishing Industry of California and beyond.

Thank you.

Ted Ventresca
President/COO
CHEMEON Surface Technology
Chemeon.com/etcpc

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/138-chromeatcm2023-AGMAbgBkBDpSMVc4.pdf>

Original File Name: CHEMEON Public CARB Comment May 2023.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-26 20:03:02

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Source Test Average for Hard Chrome Platers

Comment:

The revised data posted on 4-26-23 refer to an average source test value for hard chrome platers of 5.88E-04. The footnote 3 in table 1 points the reader to the source of that number which is Table 2. Table 2 contains a line labeled Hard with Add-On that shows seven values which do computationally average 5.88E-04. How did CARB select those seven values as representative samples for the hard chrome population? I am particularly curious how the values 0.001 and 0.0013 were selected as they do not appear to be consistent with values that would be the result of HEPA Control System source tests. If they were not from HEPA control systems, can CARB why they have chosen to create an average from a sample in which 28% of hard chrome platers do not have HEPA controls. Is that representational. Why didn't CARB simply use actual source test values from all the facilities? Does CARB have source test data from all the facilities for which this rule is being proposed? If not, why not? Has CARB asked the air districts for the data necessary for this rule? Did the air districts comply with CARB's requests? Has CARB chosen to omit some source test data which it has in its' possession from the average? If CARB has omitted data from any particular facility from the average, why? Since a key element of this rule making is the analysis of BACT, how did CARB reach a conclusion about BACT efficiency? Does CARB understand the efficiency of HEPA's? Clearly they have had some difficulty in applying and communicating the efficiency in this proposed rule. CARB staff proposes a ban, purportedly because emissions are too high even with BACT, so they should have done some studying of BACT efficiency. Observation of the emissions inventory and the changes to the emissions data to this point suggest that CARB staff did not understand BACT efficiency to this point in the process. What is the rationale for a ban in light of the HEPA efficiencies of each of the HEPA controlled facilities in California? I submitted my HEPA source test result to CARB at CARB's request prior to the rule proposal. CARB has not used my source test result to show the efficiency of my facility. Rather, it has used the much higher "average" that it has arbitrarily computed. CARB did not use my source test data to compute the average. My data has been ignored. My data would have reduced the average. My system was source tested in 2019. What was the time period of the source tests CARB used in the average they show here? My system tested at 0.000023. The average that CARB has used and applied to me and all the other hard chrome facilities in this inventory is 25 TIMES HIGHER than my actual test. Obviously, inclusion of my data would have affected that average. So, what was the logic that CARB used to exclude my

data? Did the logic used have anything to do with CARB's objectives for this rule making?

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-26 22:14:47

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Environmental Analysis needs to be changed

Comment:

In the Environmental Analysis section of the documents released last night, CARB staff states, DIRECT QUOTE "Since these values were not used in the evaluation of environmental impacts in the Draft EA, staff has determined that these changes would not require new or modified compliance responses and would not result in any new reasonably foreseeable significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of an already identified environmental impact in the Draft EA."

Wow, we are talking about CARB's estimate of ACTUAL emission levels. Not baseline emission levels, not permitted emission levels, we are talking about CARB's estimate of ACTUAL emission levels so keep that in mind and re-read the quote above.

CARB is saying that they don't need to change the environmental analysis due to a change in ACTUAL emissions "since these values were not used in the evaluation of environmental impacts in the Draft EA." in the first place!

Did you know that the State can ignore actual current environmental conditions when preparing an Environmental Analysis? I didn't. But CARB admits here that they paid no attention to ACTUAL emissions when they prepared the Draft Environmental Analysis so they don't have to react when the estimate of ACTUAL emissions changes (in this case by 50%)!

Does CARB think this is legal?

Do any other attorneys out there think this is legal?

Every day of my life I learn something new. I am learning so much about environmentalism.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-27 14:21:00

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Source Test Data Submitted

Comment:

For the record - I submitted source test information for Aviation Repair Solutions, Inc. to Eugene Rubin on November 11, 2021 via email. The data is not shown on either Table 1 next to my facility (or any other) and it is not shown on Table 2.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-28 14:15:11

No Duplicates.

Comment 5 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Edit of previous questions to CARB re amended source test average
Comment:

Because we have observed some slippery behavior from CARB during this rule making I want to edit my earlier comment in this 15-2 comment period to make clear that I am asking a question which I expect CARB to answer. In my haste, I omitted some question marks and a key word.

So, when I said this...

"If they were not from HEPA control systems, can CARB explain why they have chosen to create an average from a sample in which 28% of hard chrome platers do not have HEPA controls. Is that representational."

I meant this...

"If they were not from HEPA control systems, can CARB explain why they have chosen to create an average from a sample in which 28% of hard chrome platers do not have HEPA controls? Is that representational? Please explain and show your work."

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-29 16:19:53

No Duplicates.

Comment 6 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Fugitive Emissions Cancer Risk Estimate

Comment:

A key accusation made by CARB against the metal finishing industry is that fugitive emissions may be equally or even more dangerous to the public than stack emissions. I have previously commented on the fiction that cancer risk from stack emissions equals 213 in a million from large chrome plating facilities. Now, it is time to examine the fiction that fugitive emission cancer risks can range to 1,000 chances in a million.

The section quoted below is taken directly from Pages F-49 and F-50 of CARB's posted materials.

BEGINNING OF QUOTE

"Based on the assumptions and model setup described above, staff estimated potential cancer risks ranging from one chance per million to greater than 1,000 chances per million.

4. Conclusion

Staff recognizes that this is a high-level directional analysis and is not intended to definitively estimate fugitive emissions rates from specific chrome plating facilities. Nevertheless, the assumptions made are reasonable and this analysis provides information regarding what the potential cancer risks from fugitive emissions might be. Based on these results, it is reasonable to conclude that fugitive emissions of hexavalent chromium from chrome plating facilities are likely to contribute to cancer risks in communities surrounding such facilities."

END OF QUOTE

The quote specifically states that "The assumptions made are reasonable". You can be the judge. The entire model is described on pages F-45 to F-51.

As you can see in the first sentence, CARB is describing the cancer risk model and the data they used to generate their estimate. It is a complex model, and they describe it over several pages. As with all models, it is sensitive to the assumptions made and it is particularly sensitive to the initial data inputs. In this case, CARB does not distinguish themselves. They first attempt to answer the question "how much hex chrome is emitted from an uncontrolled tank?" Surprisingly, CARB does not quote any electrochemical science to answer this question. There is no reference to any science that shows what amount of hex chrome would be dispersed during a plating operation. Are we to believe that in 100 years of chrome plating, no scientist or chemical engineer has ever documented (or computed) the amount of hex chrome mist that comes from uncontrolled tanks? Are we also to believe CARB and/or AQMD in over 30 years of regulating chrome plating tanks have never done any math to compute hex chrome emissions from uncontrolled tanks?

CARB should answer these questions because without answers a reasonable person could conclude that established scientific facts did not support CARB's pre-ordained conclusions and had to be dismissed.

So, in the absence of science fact, here is the method they used to deduce that uncontrolled tanks produce 1 mg per amp hour of hex chrome emissions. They assumed that emissions are a function of two variables: 1) The arbitrary rule limit for fume suppressant-controlled tanks, and 2) The top-end of the manufacturers stated control efficiency of fume suppressants. Both variables happen to equal 0.1. So, dividing one into the other CARB assesses that the physical chemical electroplating process produces 1 mg per amp hour ($0.1 / 0.1 = 1.0$). There it is, feed it into the cancer risk model. Some of you are getting the drift here. You can already see that if there was any actual emission science behind the suppressant rule limit of 0.1, CARB could (or would, or should) have used it. You might also question how they decided to use 99% efficiency as their fume suppressant value when they could have used 95%. The answer to that is simple, the 99% assumption drives a higher risk value and supports the desired answer to this "study". But wait, perhaps I am too hasty in attributing to malice that which can be explained in other ways, it is possible that a summer intern performed this analysis and that perhaps the deficiency is a simple lack of quality assurance, audit function, and management oversight. I can't say.

Since I believe there are certain science facts relating to physical processes in nature, I don't buy into using the equation on page F-46 (and shown below) as the basis for the starting point to estimate fugitives. Neither should you.

"Uncontrolled tank emissions = $0.01 \text{ (mg / amp hr)} / (1-0.99) = 1 \text{ mg per amp hr}$

But let's give the intern the benefit of the doubt because maybe he only had a couple of hours to produce some data to back up the conclusions about fugitives that he was told to create.

QUESTION FOR CARB - WHAT IS THE HEX CHROME EMISSION RATE FROM UNCONTROLLED TANKS? You have been regulating these tanks for decades. Please cite scientific papers or AQMD studies to answer. Wait, there is another troubling aspect to this. Because once we calculate uncontrolled tank emissions, we must figure out what percent of the emissions get past the control systems. CARB was able to locate a US EPA manual about hoods from 1986. They wiped the dust from it, sneezed a couple of times, and ignored the fact that it pre-dated even their first chrome ATCM back in 1988. Now, 36 years later, they chose to construct an estimate of hood capture efficiency by examining it. The book said capture efficiency ranged from 50% to 100%. Yes, that is a wide range. Yes, that range includes 100% - even in 1986. But the intern, or whoever wrote this section, or whoever reviewed the work, makes the following statement.

QUOTING

"The plating industry uses a different style of hood, but lacking better information about its performance, staff chose to evaluate fugitive emissions using a range of capture efficiency from 85 percent to 95 percent."

END QUOTE

Are you kidding me? Is CARB so unaware that the source tests that the air districts require, and that we pay \$20,000 to execute, have rules about hood capture efficiency? Really? Is CARB aware that this very proposed rule I am commenting on, requires 100% hood capture efficiency by virtue of CARB finally adopting AQMD Rule 1469? Hey CARB, this is how it works. The air districts review and approve our test protocols prior to the test. Then they monitor the

test while it is performed. During the test, they observe the slot velocities, and we record them. We must perform video taped smoke tests as confirmation that they capture 100%. Only then, once 100% capture is assured, the HEPA source test is conducted. Following that, for the next few years until the next source test is performed, we are required to maintain the minimum slot velocities and perform ongoing video taped smoke tests to assure that we are always achieving a 100% capture rate. We must keep ongoing records of all this. Inspectors come and review our records and the smoke test videos.

The 1,000 chances in a million-cancer risk assertion from fugitive emissions is garbage. It is garbage because the two input variables to your cancer risk model are shown to be garbage.

Here is my question for CARB - Is this a case of simple ignorance by CARB? Maybe combined with a lack of management oversight, poor quality assurance, maybe no audit function? Or is it malicious? I know it will be tempting for you to simply declare that this comment is out-of-bounds. That it is not relevant to the fact that you simply changed the decimal point on your computed average of a few source tests. But here is the situation. We are talking about truth and the lack of truth and where CARB stands with respect to the truth about emissions. CARB wants to portray itself as the premier air pollution regulator in the world. To be the leader you must have credibility. To have credibility, you must embrace truth. At this point, it is obvious, South Coast AQMD is the world's premier air regulator. If you do not embrace the truth, you will lose credibility in your other work, which, as I understand it, involves saving the world.

Please note also, that on April 14, 2023, two weeks prior to CARB release of the corrected source test numbers on April 27, I alerted Steven Cliff, PhD and Edie Chang to this issue in advance with a heads-up as follows:

BEGIN QUOTE

"SC AQMD Rule 1469 requires ongoing smoke test validation and periodic monitoring of slot velocities to assure the push/pulls are capturing 100%. We validate this in our source tests. Despite that, the CARB estimate is somewhere between 85% and 95% according to your text and the footnoted source is a tech manual from 1986. The assumption and math that was used to get to the 1 mg / amp hour tank rate is suspect since the rule limit used to start that equation is arbitrary to start with."

END QUOTE

By all appearances, CARB has chosen not to correct the record regarding the critical element of fugitive emissions.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-04-29 18:55:29

No Duplicates.

Comment 7 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: The "Do Nothing" Alternative

Comment:

The result of the State's business case for this rule proposal is found in the SRIA on page SRIA 2. It shows that rule implementation will achieve a cumulative benefit of 132 pounds of potential emissions over the next 20 years. The backup year by year savings that drive this number are found in Table 2.3 on page SRIA 23. You will need to total the values across the rows of Table 2.3 and multiply by the years represented and add them at the bottom. If you do that math, you will be rewarded. The numbers will add up and support CARB's assertion of a 132 pound reduction in potential chrome emissions over the next 20 years. It is important to note that the baseline CARB uses to support this calculation is set at 10.15 pounds per year.

CARB's re-computation of the actual emissions by chrome platers was recently made available on April 26. It tells us in Table VI.1 on page 21 of the 15 day 2nd release that actual industry emissions from all sources are 1.05 pounds per year (see the lower right corner of the table). If we look to the left by two columns on the same table we can see that CARB is still using the 10.15 pound annual baseline. If the baseline is 10.15 and the actual emission is 1.05, then the difference between these values is 9.1 pounds. So, we are getting 9.1 pounds of chrome reduction per year already. If we extend our current savings for the next 20 years, we will achieve 182 pounds of benefit.

It is possible to put this on a table for easier understanding...

		ATCM
Do Nothing		
Reduced Potential Hex Chrome lbs.	132 lbs.	182
Cost to the California Economy 0	\$ 688 Million	\$

CARB data and logic support the case that doing absolutely nothing is preferable to the proposed ATCM with a ban.

This analysis was enabled by the flawed assumptions and faulty logic that CARB (with cooperation from the California Department of Finance) has employed regularly throughout this rulemaking. It should be apparent to the reader that CARB's estimate of actual industry emissions proves a ban is not necessary.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-05 19:18:13

No Duplicates.

Comment 8 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Source Test Averages not used in Baseline?

Comment:

SRIA 1.6, pages 14-16 describe the construction of CARB's baseline for this rule. CARB has stated that the annual baseline is 10.15 pounds per year. On page SRIA 15, the last sentence of the third paragraph states, and I quote:

"Considering BASELINE EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS WERE BASED ON SOURCE TESTING INFORMATION in 2019 or earlier, outside of the pandemic timeframe, staff estimates that emissions will remain the same in future years in the baseline scenario".

Again, the SRIA states that the "BASELINE EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS WERE BASED ON SOURCE TESTING INFORMATION".

But this is not true.

As clearly shown on the third version of the still incorrect Table 1, the computation of the baseline in Column 6 is:

"(permitted annual throughput) X (2007 emission factor) = (Potential to emit) = 10.15 pounds"

Do you see any reference to source test information in that formula? I do not.

Because of this explicit statement "BASELINE EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS WERE BASED ON SOURCE TESTING INFORMATION", Along with our reasonable expectation that computation of a baseline should incorporate consideration of actual conditions, the metal finishing community had an expectation that the third correction of Table 1 would incorporate a comprehensive review of the entire data set and the computations and assumptions used within it. We expected two-way communication from a staff concerned about accuracy and truth, but communication was not forthcoming. Staff chose to modify only a single value which they have labeled as the "average" hard chrome source test result. The modified value did have cascading effects, and did change calculated total annual emissions, but the aggregate actual emission sum (1.05 pounds) is still incorrect and overstated. It is incorrect due to errors of omission, errors of assumptions, and logic errors which still exist in the table(s) (inclusive of Table 2).

Why is CARB playing this game wherein they do not engage in dialogue with industry on this rule? Why are our written inputs,

provided in these public (and many non-public emails) being ignored?

Is CARB staff under direction to not work with industry on this rule?

Why does CARB state that the baseline is computed based on source tests, when it clearly is not? Why does the baseline exceed actual emissions by a factor of 10X?

Has CARB notified the California Department of Finance that the data used to construct the SRIA baseline is not based on actual or source tested emissions?

Has the decision to ban chrome plating in California already been made? Were the SRIA, ISOR, emissions inventory, health risk assessment generated to document, after the fact, a decision already made by the legislature? Or CARB? Or the governor?

Is there an audit function within the State of California which reviews agency procedure, practice, and engagement with the public?

Is science in California a political process?

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-07 07:57:49

No Duplicates.

Comment 9 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Art

Last Name: Holman

Email Address: art@shermplating.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Emission errors

Comment:

I have been in the plating industry for many years and what is being done to this industry is nothing short of criminal, I don't have the ability to check data points on emissions as CARB or even claim to have the time to calculate such emission values if that information was provided. However, CARB has not provided accurate data to stakeholders on emissions or even the current number of facilities in operation.

This proposed ban is being based off 2019 pre pandemic data at best, which leads to the question as to why we are not using current emission data for accuracy when all of that information is readily available? Every year we must submit amp/hr. usage to our local air resources boards all across the state. How hard can it be for CARB to have the local agencies send current year end reports for 2022 to obtain accurate emission data?

I have briefly reviewed just local data provided by CARB staff in the San Joaquin Valley APCD and the Permitted Annual Throughput Amp/Hrs. reported column is flawed by a huge number. Two facilities that were permitted for a total of 10,500,000-amp hrs. in 2019 are not even in business now. That is two facilities out of the six that have closed and it took about an hour of my time to confirm. Another data point that jumps out is one decorative facility permitted for 41,328,000 amp-hrs. and have throughput of that exact amount? And this is not the only example as there are eight facilities by CARB's numbers that are running at maximum allowable permitted numbers in the decorative columns alone.

My experience in this industry of over 4 decades tells me this is highly unlikely; it is more likely that staff didn't have throughput emission numbers and plugged in maximum allowable to complete the chart. This causes incorrect data points and elevates emission values across the decorative side of the industry.

I can only surmise that if these emission values are used in the decorative side, then what kind of errors are being made in the hard chrome and anodizing emission charts? As stakeholders how do we know that the input data is correct? CARB staff don't seem to have to check their work for accuracy as we do as stakeholders. If we supply incorrect data to a regulatory agency, we are held accountable or fined even for a mathematical mistake.

It has become obvious that the goal is to push this rule through at all costs as soon as possible even if the facts don't support CARB's claim that the chrome finishing industry is a major contributor of hexavalent chrome emissions in the state.

Time has come to pause this draconian rule and reevaluate the emission data with accuracy and integrity before moving forward

with any proposed new regulations, let alone a ban date that will severely harm the finishing industry here in California while providing no meaningful reduction of hexavalent chrome emissions in the state.

Sincerely,
Art Holman
Sherm's Custom Plating

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-09 07:36:15

No Duplicates.

Comment 10 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Bobbi

Last Name: Burns

Email Address: bobbiburns@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation: MFANC

Subject: Data still inaccurate

Comment:

The second 15 day comment period allows comment on the minor decimal correction of the Hard Chrome but the ISOR and the SRIA is still WRONG. Many of us in the metal finishing industry have questioned the data from the beginning. CARB has had access to data from the air districts and yet when I look at the emissions inventory I am confused. It seems like CARB is missing a lot of data so they are making up some generic calculations, using permitted amp/hrs as the reported throughput and a generic emissions calculation just to fill a blank space. How is CARB still moving forward with a vote to BAN without accurate numbers? It appears that CARB has had an agenda to BAN the Hex Chrome from the beginning and then find ways to justify it. CARB is not working with the Industry. The ATCM has reduced emissions over the last decades and can continue to do more with an emission based rule. I urge CARB Staff and CARB Board to re-evaluate and correct the data before thousands of good jobs and businesses are lost in California.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-09 11:08:58

No Duplicates.

Comment 11 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: No Safe Level

Comment:

According to the World Health Organization (WHO), there is no safe level of alcohol consumption for humans. It is a class 1 carcinogen and contributes to seven different cancers.

See:

<https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/04-01-2023-no-level-of-alcohol-consumption-is-safe-for-our-health#:~:text=The%20risks%20and%20harms%20associated,that%20does%20not%20affect%20health.>

Yet, California actively promotes alcoholic beverages (wine) produced in the State and the governor of California owns a winery.

The CARB hypocrisy about having to ban chrome platers because there is no known safe level of hexavalent chromium is very hard to swallow in this context. Apparently, someone in California government does have the authority to override governmental agencies when it comes to the "no safe limit" argument.

I always filter my wine through a HEPA system.

Have a nice day.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-09 13:16:20

No Duplicates.

Comment 12 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Charles

Last Name: Pomeroy

Email Address: cpomeroy@stilesomeroy.com

Affiliation: MFACA

Subject: Letter to CARB Re Chrome Platers Proposed ATCM (Second Notice) w Attachments
Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/151-chromeatcm2023-WnFQaVEiUW4EYm0d.pdf>

Original File Name: (23.5.10) Letter to CARB Re Chrome Platers Proposed ATCM (Second Notice) w Att..pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-10 12:08:21

No Duplicates.

Comment 13 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Tracey

Last Name: Coss

Email Address: traceycoss@scpci.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Second 15-Day Notice

Comment:

CARB has only addressed the decimal placement error for Hard Chrome in this second 15-day comment period. The emission numbers after the decimal place correction are STILL WRONG. Modifications and additional environmental analysis are necessary and required. CARB is proposing to ban a chemistry/process without good data or real evidence of emission problems. The emissions data remain flawed, inaccurate, and inconsistent in the record as originally presented, in the first 15-day Notice of proposed changes, and in this second 15-day Notice of proposed changes. Without correct information, the conclusions drawn by CARB are based on flawed assumptions, which will potentially lead to legal challenges.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-10 16:10:53

No Duplicates.

Comment 14 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Jerry

Last Name: Desmond

Email Address: jerry@desmondlobbyfirm.com

Affiliation: MFANC-MFASC-NASF

Subject: Public Comments

Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/153-chromeatcm2023-Vj5QNFYxUWYKUM0D.pdf>

Original File Name: CARB CrVI ATCM Letter 5-10-23.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-10 16:47:00

No Duplicates.

Comment 15 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: James

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Marginal Benefit of a ban

Comment:

Consider the marginal benefit to the public of including the future-dated 2039 ban in the rule. Especially consider that the ban is subject to "technology reviews" which will require CARB staff and industry to come to agreement about factual truths. The ban is 15 years away. There is no imminent benefit, only the cost of industry leaving the state and costing jobs in the communities the board believes they are protecting. CARB staff and industry do not agree today that the emissions inventory presented by CARB is factual. The source test average for hard chrome platers, in reality, is not the 0.000588 mg per amp-hour that CARB has presented. This is a fact that the board can verify prior to a vote. The board should insist that CARB staff provide them the source test data for all facilities for verification. The board has a duty to base decisions on facts. If decisions are not based on verifiable truth, of what value is a technology review? It serves no purpose except to appear to mitigate the impact of a ban which has a political motivation rather than a factual motivation. A ban does not spur investment by small plating firms to invent the replacement for hexavalent chrome. Each board member must decide where her moral axis is with respect to truth. Choose truth. Why is there a need for CARB to present untruthful and misleading data to the public in order to enact this rule? Are you a part of it? Why are you on the CARB board? Are you a tool of a political patron or an independent thinker?

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-11 13:16:08

No Duplicates.

Comment 16 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-2.

First Name: Sylvia
Last Name: Rodriguez
Email Address: sylvia.rodriguez@amexplating.com
Affiliation: MFANC

Subject: Comments to Second Notice
Comment:

Comments are in the file.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/444-chromeatcm2023-VGZWYwMyVzEEM1R1.pdf>

Original File Name: 230511 CARB -Via electronic submission.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-05-11 21:24:48

No Duplicates.

Comment 1 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-3.

First Name: CARMEN

Last Name: CAMPBELL

Email Address: lab@anaplexcorp.com

Affiliation:

Subject: NEW AMMENDEND HEX CHROME RULE

Comment:

To whom it may concern,

As a minority part owner of a metal finishing company; I appreciate the community concerns regarding toxics that affect our environment. But to be fair the community is the one who works for facilities like metal finishers and some for over 20 years without any medical concerns related to exposure. Is unfortunate that the lack of industry science data knowledge hasn't been taken into consideration in regard to the true impact the aerospace manufacturing industry has in the state of California. The industry from 2017-present has gone thru many changes that have modified the way the industry operates in favor of improving our environment air quality. Many have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in Best Available Equipment to improve the environment. As some of the Board members questioned, why if there are bigger fish in the pond contributing higher levels of toxics why are we targeting the least contributor? In addition, rules are created to regulate and monitor not meant to band business without taken into consideration the lack of alternatives to some. Is like COVID; it was new, nearly took out a government, did take out businesses but later with research and experiments were able to find ways to deal with a KILLER VIRUS. Thank you for your time and consideration. WE NEED COMMON SENSE RULES.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-10-17 08:11:44

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-3.

First Name: Jerry

Last Name: Desmond

Email Address: jerry@desmondlobbyfirm.com

Affiliation: Metal Finishing Association of CA

Subject: Comments on Third Notice of Availability of Modified Text

Comment:

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/453-chromeatcm2023-VjVTNABzBTQBWFAz.pdf>

Original File Name: CARB CrVI ATCM Letter 10-20-23.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-10-20 13:58:07

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-3.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation: Aviation Repair Solutions, Inc

Subject: CARB eliminates BACT option without analysis of BACT

Comment:

This comment pertains to the revision of paragraph one of section 93102.4 to eliminate the phrase "except for those facilities that only operate enclosed hexavalent chromium plating tank" (sic). With this change, the rule rejects the final candidate for BACT even though no analysis was done or shown to the public to support the decision.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to follow the California Health and Safety Code. This is what the health and safety code has to say about CARB's authority to regulate. CARB is to:

"reduce emissions to the lowest level achievable through application of best available control technology or a more effective control method, unless the state board or a district board determines, based on an assessment of risk, that an alternative level of emission reduction is adequate or necessary to prevent an endangerment of public health"

CARB has not proposed a more effective control method in this regulation. CARB has proposed a ban. Labelled a "phaseout", it is an elimination of the industry. It is a ban. A ban is not a control method. A phase out is not a control method. CARB did not analyze existing or potential BACT. CARB did not propose a BACT. The elimination of enclosed hexavalent control tanks as a compliance option is the last straw. Enclosed hexavalent chrome plating tanks were potentially a BACT. But now, with their elimination, without analysis, CARB will be completely in violation of the California Health and Safety Code.

A careful reading of the health and safety passage above reveals the law does offer CARB the option of performing a risk assessment to establish the necessity of an alternative to BACT, but CARB did not perform a compliant risk analysis. To assess and compare risks in a compliant fashion, CARB would have had to analyze BACT and BACT alternatives. CARB would have had to select one of those alternatives and then analyze the incremental risk that alternative would have created. CARB did not do that. CARB created a risk analysis that was based on an arbitrary emissions limit that CARB set. That emissions limit was one half the previous limit. There is no presentation of any analysis or conclusion explaining why exactly one half the previous emission limit was chosen. There is no analysis explaining why zero, a ban, is a necessity considering

the emission levels that currently available BACT options present. The table below points this out.

Level	Comment	Emission
2007 ATCM Limit		0.0015000 This is the existing rule
2023 ATCM Limit (This Rule)	proposed limit	0.0007500 This is CARBs
Hard HEPA (Av Repair Sol)	ATCM proposed limit	0.0000230 32 times BELOW this
Hard with Covers (Merlin Tanks)	ATCM proposed limit	0.0000041 183 times BELOW this

The Aviation Repair Solutions, Inc. source test shown in the table was a "Non-Detect" for hex chrome. It reflects the emission rate at the detection limit under a very heavy plating amp hour load. It was a zero emission which only shows as a non-zero emission rate because of CARB rules about detection limits. The emission rate shown in the table for enclosed hooded tanks is even lower and was also very likely a non-detect for hex chrome. CARB failed to evaluate these two zero emission control technologies (HEPA and Enclosed Tanks) as BACT.

CARB does not reveal any discussion of BACT in the rule making record as is required by law. There is no identification of a BACT. There is no analysis of any BACT emission rate or of any candidate BACT emission rates. The emission inventory shows emission rates by type of emitter and in some cases averages them but it does not show a rate for candidate BACTs. (But since the enclosed tank - Merlin statistic is alone on the table, we can see its' rate). For hard chrome, CARB appears to have taken an average of all hard chrome tests (0.0005588). But, since that is an average of tests applying to a set of different control technologies, it is invalid to have been used in replacement for the legal BACT requirement.

The Health Risk Assessment (Appendix F) did not analyze risk relative to any BACT. Rather, it analyzed the risk associated with the completely arbitrary 0.00075 proposed emission limit. An emission limit is not a BACT. Analyzing the risk of a limit is not the same as analyzing the risk of a control technology. The proposed rule materials provide no analysis or supporting rationale why the halving of the current limit to 0.00075 is or is not related to any BACT or to any particular level of public health. It is just a number that is half the previous number. One wonders why CARB took 2 or 3 years to produce the rule. We can see from the table above that had CARB selected a BACT for analysis (either HEPA or Merlin tank) they could have performed the risk assessment with values of 0.000023 or 0.0000041 but they did not. CARB provided no rationale why they performed a risk analysis that assumed emission levels would be 0.00075 when we can clearly see that much lower emission rates are possible with current BACT alternatives. CARB used a value for the risk analysis that is 32 to 183 times higher than what these two potential BACTs can achieve. They created a strawman. They created a strawman number that, when analyzed as a risk proxy would fail and show potential harm to the public. The tables CARB constructed to show potential emission risks are not constructed with BACT, they are constructed with the strawman emission level. 213 in a million, communicated by CARB staff to the board, to the media, and to the public is a false risk.

The emission model(s) in Appendix F use the strawman emission level, they do not use BACT. As shown by the table above, the BACT

from enclosed hexavalent chrome plating tanks is 183 times better than CARB'S "PIDOMA" number. CARB's allegation about 213 in a million cancer risks from large facilities are not based on the HEPA systems those facilities are already required to use and are in use, rather they are based on the false strawman. How cynical, how deceptive, how misleading to the public is this? How damaging is this to the regulated industry? An industry which has spent millions of dollars buying the BACT devices that this governmental agency did not even analyze before declaring them insufficient.

CARB (in this rule) and the SC AQMD (currently) require facilities to conduct source tests of HEPA systems (BACT). The test results must be submitted to the regulator (air district) for regulatory review. South Coast facilities have done this for more than a decade. So, there is a rich set of data from which CARB could have conducted the legally required analysis of BACT. That data exists at SC AQMD (at least) and likely at several other regulators as well. CARB did not review or analyze that data. CARB proves this in the FSOR. CARB admits asking for the air districts to provide data and explains that data was not provided by the districts. Industry was not notified of this but industry is paying the price for the governmental dysfunction. The fact that one or two districts may have failed to be in on the conspiracy and a few results were provided (fourteen out of 110 facilities) adds a little color to the story but it is still a story of incompetence at best and malevolence at worst. There is no BACT analysis because of governmental dysfunction.

It is even more damning to consider that industry has paid millions of dollars to implement control technologies that are capable of producing zero measured emissions and can achieve "Non-Detect" under heavy load conditions and yet CARB did not analyze them. CARB did this even though the owners of that equipment are required by existing regulations to source test them and turn the data over to the air districts. CARB didn't use the data turned over to the air districts. Even more confounding is that CARB, IN THIS VERY RULE PROPOSAL, is requiring industry to increase the frequency of source testing by a factor of 2.5 and to continue turning the data over to the air districts. For what reason? So that CARB will again, not use the data to determine if their own rule is effective? CARB may have unlimited resources with which to pay people to sit around and not perform analyses but industry does not have the ability to waste money. These source tests cost at least \$15,000 each considering lost production time and test fees. It is astounding.

I have made public comment from the beginning of public comment (my only opportunity to provide input) about the deficiency of the CARB "emission inventory" and pointed to the lack of correct BACT source test information. CARB staff has ignored me and took this to board vote with full knowledge of this deficiency and lack of compliance with law. I pointed out to CARB that I had provided them with source test information about Aviation Repair Solutions, Inc., two years ago and that it had not been used. CARB's response to my comments and to my provision of source test data in the FSOR is damning. In Master Response 13 CARB states: "industry was not forthcoming in providing source test data that could be verified". This is not a statement about industry providing data, it is a statement about CARB's inability to verify based on not being able to work with SC AQMD! This CARB response could even be viewed by the public as CARB stating industry had lied about data! One could imply that the data I provided was somehow not valid (verifiable) when in fact, it was the government that failed to call another

branch and request verification. CARB was to lazy to pick up a phone and call SC AQMD! There is no restriction on our source test data that prevents AQMD from verifying the summary number or a non-detect! Yet, CARB hides behind this lamest of excuses. In Master Response 11 CARB states: "This included information about actual throughput and source test data. To date, staff have not received any verifiable sources test data from members of industry. Staff has received purported source test results from specific facility owners, but that information was summary in nature, and when staff requested the source test reports that would allow us to verify the values, those reports were not provided." They go on to state in Master Response 11: CARB staff also requested source test data from the Districts. In response to that request, CARB staff received verifiable source test data from the Districts for 14 facilities. Since that was the data that was available at the time of staff's analysis, that is what was used in determining the source tested emission factors."

That last quoted segment in Master Response 11 is proof that CARB cared more about an expedient result than a correct result - "available at the time of staff's analysis". Let's also note that the staff analysis referred to here must have occurred prior to the publishing of the initial proposed rule and prior to any of the public comment periods. We know that because we see the use of only the 14 facilities right from the beginning. No adjustment was made as more data became available (if it did) and no adjustment was made as a result of public comments even though public comment were calling the deficiency to CARB's attention. Truly pathetic behavior by CARB and by CARB attorneys who should have been doing internal verifications to assure that CARB was putting truth out to the public.

Even with the 14 collected source results that the districts did turn over, CARB did not make a presentation of BACT alternatives, or results, or selection of a single BACT emission level from which a relevant risk assessment could be made.

The risk assessment presented in appendix F shows the risks the public would face from an agency that does not follow the law and analyze BACT and set emission levels using BACT.

How can a risk assessment with a falsely inflated strawman baseline and which features no analysis of risks from BACT be used to prove necessity? The law is clear. The law requires necessity be shown if CARB is to deviate from a BACT approach.

Today the public is breathing 99 times more hex chrome emissions in California than produced by the metal finishing industry. We are only 1% of emissions. After this lengthy, costly, two to three year effort, in which there was virtually no two-way involvement and communication between the CARB and industry, the competence of which is described above, CARB will eliminate 1% of emissions in the State. The other 99% will remain. Chair Randolph and Vice Chair Sandra Berg asked staff about this in one of the CARB meetings. Randolph asked, "is it true that metal finishing is only 1%" and Berg asked "what are we doing about the refineries?". Staff answered that the 1% was consistent with CARB data and that CARB had imposed plenty of other requirements on the refineries. (Note: there is no ban of refineries due to hex chrome). So, I will ask the question, what is the BACT that CARB has apparently found to be acceptable for the refineries, the cement plants, the welders, the forges, etc.? These emitters (99% of the hex chrome emitters in

the state) are not banned but the same toxin is being emitted. There is no consistency in CARBs behavior.

The State of California needs roads, bridges, buildings, rail, and aircraft, all of which may require some emission of hexavalent chromium.

There may be a staffer/manager/board member at CARB who tries to remove this comment and claim that it is out-of-scope to the issue of "enclosed chrome plating tanks" from which it is derived. That staffer/manager/board member is the very one who should be removed if CARB wants to resume being a data and science-based regulator. Data and science-based people don't find excuses for not collecting appropriate data for analysis. Data and science-based people do not avoid analysis. They are not afraid of analysis. Data and science-based people do not construct strawman baselines from which false progress can be claimed and false risks assessed. Data and science-based people do not construct elaborate ruses filled with half-truths (data could not be verified) to fool the public. Data and science-based people do not find ways to remove comments like this from public comment because they are not afraid of analysis. This comment is in scope because it questions the removal of a BACT alternative without analysis and in light of a risk assessment that did not consider BACT and in light of nearly a hundred times more emissions of the same toxic in the state by entities who have lesser controls than we do.

Ignorance is one thing. The willful continuation of ignorance (avoiding data collection and analysis) has other names. Willful continuation of ignorance in violation of law takes things to a whole other level.

It is past the time to do your lawful duty CARB.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-10-24 12:27:13

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-3.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: What is the specific logic CARB used to bypass the Health and Safety Code?

Comment:

What is the specific logic path CARB used to reject enclosed hexavalent chrome tanks and HEPA ?

1) Is a "phaseout" (or ban) a "more effective control method"? If yes, what is the control?

2) Did the CARB perform an assessment of risk? When was it accomplished? Where are the results of it? Does CARB assert it is appendix F?

3) Relative to an alternative level of emission reduction, how was "adequacy" of HEPA and enclosed tank rejected? What analysis was performed? When was the analysis performed? When did the rejection decision occur? Was the public or any working group able to provide feedback to CARB about the analysis data and methods?

4) Relative to an alternate level of emission reduction, how was "necessity" established? Was there an analysis performed? What were the criteria used to determine necessity? When was the analysis performed? When was the decision made?

5) What is the logic that makes it a necessity to ban enclosed hexavalent chrome tanks and chrome tanks with HEPA controls but makes it not a necessity to ban welding, thermal spray, machining, heat treating, cement making, cement destruction, forging, recycling, refineries, driving cars and trucks (including electric) with brakes, etc., many of which do not require even HEPA?

Please provide a response in the public record (FSOR).

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-10-27 07:52:54

No Duplicates.

Comment 5 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-3.

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Meyer

Email Address: jmeyer@aviation-repair.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Verification of Inputs

Comment:

I have stated in public comment that CARB did not use the HEPA source test data I provided them regarding our 2019 Source Test which was a non-detect for hex chrome emissions.

CARB responded to my comment by claiming our data could not be verified (See Response 203 and also the Master Responses 11 and 13).

It is very important for the reader to understand that industry had a reasonable expectation that source test information we were required by law to turn over to the air districts was available to CARB. So, why would industry turn source test data over to CARB? We thought they had it. The question that should be asked, and I will ask it now is: Why didn't CARB tell industry that they needed our Source Test Information? CARB never revealed the lack of source test data to industry until publication of the FSOR. So, when CARB states in Master Response 13 that industry "was not forthcoming in providing source test data", this is beyond the bounds of what reasonable people would consider as an appropriate response in a public record. CARB should apologize to the public and to industry for this statement. Or, maybe CARB should reveal how and when they did inform industry of their lack of source test data. I was not informed of CARB's lack of data until the FSOR. CARB, in my opinion, was not interested in seeing data that would lead to a different conclusion than they had already reached. This was not an unbiased process.

But wait, there is more, CARB reports in the rulemaking materials that they did meet with Mr. Hugh Brown. Mr. Brown is a leading authority on source testing and CARB met with him because he is a highly respected expert on the topic. CARB should provide the record of discussion in that meeting. Did CARB inquire about my source test? Did CARB ask about HEPA efficiencies Hugh Brown had observed? If asked, Mr. Brown could have easily verified our source test result with CARB because he wrote our source test protocol and personally performed our source test. He is a credible verification source, a third party, and the individual who signed the report submitted to AQMD. So, CARB's statement that my submittal was not verifiable is incorrect for two reasons; they could have verified with AQMD and they could have verified with the man who performed the test, both of whom they met and communicated with. At the conclusion of our source test, Mr. Brown informed me that we had achieved a non-detect for hex chrome in our test and our source

test result memorialized that outcome. I hereby grant CARB permission to view my source test result on hand with SC AQMD for the purpose of verifying a non-detect and an emission rate of 0.000023. I also give permission to SC AQMD to show the test to CARB. Please let me know if anything else stands in your way.

Lastly, I wonder how many other members of industry and of the public were faced with the additional barrier to comment that was imposed on me and which is documented in Response 203. CARB states:

"The commentor did submit a document that summarized a number of source test runs from 2009 and 2019. However, this data was presented in a one-page summary created by the commentor. The commentor did not provide the source test reports from the source testing companies that conducted the tests. As such, CARB staff could not confirm the validity of this data. For that reason, the unsubstantiated data was not used. CARB staff made no changes to the Proposed Amendments based on the received comments."

Setting aside CARBs failure to alert me to any problem with my input, how many other members of industry and the public were held to this standard? Inputs should not be "created by the commenter", "the commenter did not provide the source test reports", "CARB staff could not confirm the validity of the data". Why did my inputs to CARB require third party verification to be considered? Is that fair? Were comments from the public alluding to bad smells near some facilities thrown out for lack of third party verifiability?

This is not a comment about the most recent change to the proposed rule. This comment is the first available opportunity to respond publicly to the low blow CARB dished out in the FSOR response highlighted above. I hope CARB will see a reason to keep this comment in the record and respond to this comment in a revised FSOR. We do want the public record about this rule to be accurate don't

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-10-27 10:03:31

No Duplicates.

Comment 6 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-3.

First Name: David

Last Name: Hill

Email Address: davidhill@electrolizingofla.com

Affiliation: Electrolizing

Subject: HEX Chrome Ban

Comment:

Our company is a chrome plating processing facility in Los Angeles CA since 1947. We have been processing parts for aerospace, medical equipment and military equipment applications among others. We are a necessary and essential business provider for our customers in their various industries. Military and commercial aircrafts require what we process as well as outline how we process. All environmental and regulatory requirements set forth by the state of California are the strictest in the nation and therefore required to be adhered to in order to remain open and processing. The regulations currently in place are specifically outlined to ensure that NO harmful chemicals are being discharged into local waterways or into the air from our facility. The county of LA is thoroughly monitoring and testing all facilities to ensure current compliance for PFAS and hexavalent chrome restrictions. We are a facility that has been tested and found to be in full compliance with no detriment to our employees and local environment.

We here at Electrolizing have invested over \$1 million to ensure the safety of our employees and surrounding community. There is no suitable alternative that would comply with the specification requirements for original equipment manufacturers in aerospace. Industrial chrome processing is highly regulated to ensure environmental and personnel safety. Our processing is situated as such that we emit no hexavalent chromium into the air at any time. We have been a spearhead in the industry for air quality by adding highly specialized covers and hydrogen gas absorbing filament in those covers which filter/ resist 100% of the hexavalent chromium.

What has not been published is what the industry is doing to ensure that any detriment to the local population or environment is mitigated / eliminated. Advancements in information that is available as well as requirements that are currently being adhered to are not mentioned. The article notes that California has the strictest laws in the country regarding this issue.

With the time and dollar value invested for health and safety, our company has taken into consideration far more then what was listed or not listed in the article regarding what the industry is doing to prevent any further detriment to the air, landscape and waterways. Furthermore, our stance is that we should not be included in the 2039 ban on hexavalent chrome use in California based on the fact that we emit no hexavalent chrome fumes during any point in our process. Being classified as an essential business during COVID we continued to serve our US military and commercial air crafts during the pandemic with industry leading parts to

ensure upmost safety. As a locally female owned business, we would be remis to fall under the same classification as the unregulated or noncompliant companies.

Thank you for your consideration,
Susan B. Grant
Owner / General Manager

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/457-chromeatcm2023-BmNROwBkVGQEdlAi.docx>

Original File Name: Electrolizing letter.docx

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-10-30 14:32:51

No Duplicates.

Comment 7 for Proposed Amendments to the ATCM for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations (chromeatcm2023) - 15-3.

First Name: Florence

Last Name: Gharibian

Email Address: florencegharibian@yahoo.com

Affiliation: Del Amo Action Committee

Subject: ATCM Amendments

Comment:

October 30, 2023

On October 16, 2023. the California Air Resources Board released the Chrome Plating ATCM Third Notice of Public Availability of Modified Text. Amendments to the Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Chromium Electroplating and Chromic Acid Anodizing Operations. We support the proposed amendments and commend the staff for the integrity of this work.

This correspondence provides comments on the document. As mentioned, in previous correspondence we were encouraged by the Board's approval of the ATCM Amendments. Greg Harris and his staff modified the language to correct grammatical errors and more importantly to clarify the language in the document.

Florence Gharibian, Chair of the Del Amo Action Committee served as a Branch Chief in Department of Toxic Substances Control Enforcement Program for several years. Ambiguous language diminishes the ability of inspectors to do the important work of ensuring regulatory requirements are met. It can also make compliance more difficult.

As example of clarification of the ATCM Amendments staff removed the word "only" and removed the phrase "except for the requirements set in 93102.4" to clarify the applicability requirements for facilities that have enclosed hexavalent chromium plating tank(s). This modification was necessary and strengthens the ASTM. The modification makes it clear that chromium plating tanks are subject to that section's requirements for facilities that use hexavalent chromium. Clearly the enclosure of hexavalent chromium plating tank(s) is necessary and significantly reduces air emissions of this dangerous chemical.

Thank You for providing an opportunity to comment,

Florence Gharibian, Chair Board of Directors

Del Amo Action Committee

Cynthia Babich, Director

Del Amo Action Committee

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/458-chromeatcm2023-B2FVP10zVHVQMwRq.pdf>

Original File Name: FlorenceHexChrome10302023 (9).pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2023-10-31 15:57:54

No Duplicates.