

I-710 EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE

Thursday, October 29, 2009

6:30 PM Meeting

Gateway Cities Council of Governments
2nd Floor Conference Room
16401 Paramount Boulevard
Paramount, CA

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL – BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA – This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s)
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS
- VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the April 30, 2009, meeting of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee
- VII. APPOINT ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES
- VIII. I-710 PROJECT COMMITTEE 2010 MEETING SCHEDULE
- IX. REPORTS
 - A. Status Report on I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS
 1. Engineering - Status Report
 - a. Schedule
 - b. Completed Tasks/Studies (preceding 6 months)
 - c. Current Tasks/Studies
 - d. 3-Month Look Ahead
 - e. Alternative Technology Report – Peer Review Results – MTA Staff



Metro



2. Environmental – Status Report
 - a. Overall Status
 - b. Traffic Model Update
 - c. Field Surveys
 - d. Community Impact Assessment (community profiles)
 - e. Cumulative Projects List Update
 - f. Other Studies
 - g. 3-month Look Ahead

3. Community Participation – Status Report
 - a. Local Advisory Committees
 - b. Subject Working Groups
 - c. Corridor Advisory Committee
 - d. Meetings Update List and Schedule
 - e. 3-Month Look Ahead

SUGGESTED ACTION: Received and File and/or Give Direction to Staff

B. Updated Ports' Cargo Forecast Presentation

SUGGESTED ACTION: Received and File and/or Give Direction to Staff

C. Air Quality Action Plan Update and Review of Draft" Scope of Work by Gateway Cities COG Staff

SUGGESTED ACTION: 1. Receive and File Status Report; and 2. Concur with "Draft" Scope of Work; and/or Give Direction to Staff

D. Alternative 6B (widen 10 general purpose lanes + 4 freight movement lanes (zero emission trucks)) – Revised TAC Recommendation

SUGGESTED ACTION: Concur with TAC Recommendation and/or Give Direction to Staff

E. Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) Recommendations

SUGGESTED ACTION: Concur that the recommendations from the CAC be used for further analysis in the environmental phase; and/or Give Direction to Staff.

F. ITS Implementation Plan for Goods Movement – Update by Gateway Cities COG

SUGGESTED ACTION: Received and File and/or Give Direction to Staff



Metro



Caltrans



X. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

XI. ADJOURNMENT



VI. CONSENT CALENDAR
Item A

Approval of Minutes
April 30, 2009

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE I-710 EIR/EIS CORRIDOR PROJECT COMMITTEE**

**A Meeting Held at the Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Blvd.
Paramount, CA**

April 30, 2009

I. Call to Order

Co-Chair Hurtado called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by Self-Introductions

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Gil Hurtado, City of South Gate, Co-Chair; George Mirabal, City of Bell; Hugo Argumedo, City of Commerce; Frank Gurule, City of Cudahy; Val Lerch, City of Long Beach; Felipe Aguirre, City of Maywood; Gene Daniels, City of Paramount; Larry Forester, City of Signal Hill; Pat DeChellis, County of Los Angeles; Dr. Mike Walter, Port of Long Beach; Jerilyn Lopez Mendoza, Port of Los Angeles; Joe Aguilar, I-5 JPA; Doug Failing, Caltrans; Diane DuBois, MTA; Barbara Messina, SGVCOG; Susan Seamans, SBCCOG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Sergio Infanzon, City of Bell Gardens; Jim Dear, City of Carson; Lillie Dobson, City of Compton; Anne Bayer, City of Downey; Elba Guerrero, City of Huntington Park; Maria T. Santillan, City of Lynwood; William Davis, City of Vernon; Rich Macias, SCAG.

ALSO PRESENT: South Gate Councilmember Bill DeWitt; Bill Pagett, City Engineer, City of Paramount, I-710 TAC Chair; Alex Hamilton, City of Commerce; Mark Christoffels, City Engineer, City of Long Beach; Jerry Caligiuri, Office of the 9th Council District, City of Long Beach; Barbara Munoz, Director of Public Works, City of Signal Hill; Mohammad Mostahkami, City Engineer, City of South Gate; Phil Doudar, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; Sue Lai, Traffic Engineer, Port of Los Angeles; Jolene Hayes, Transit Development Manager, Port of Long Beach; Brian Mineghian, Office of Assemblymember Warren Furutani; Jacki Bacharach, Executive Director, SBCCOG; Abdi Saghafi, Project Manager, Caltrans; Garrett Damrath, Caltrans Environmental Planning; Ernest Morales, Deputy Executive Officer, Metro; Devon Cichoski, Communications Manager, Metro; Adrian Alvarez, Transportation Planner, Metro; Connie Turner, Region Manager, Southern California Edison; Mary Fitzpatrick, Change Champion, Southern California Edison; Philip Law, Corridors Program Manager, SCAG; Michelle Noch, Community Planner, FHWA; Cesar Perez, Senior

Transportation Engineer, FHWA; Richard Powers, Executive Director, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, Deputy Executive Director, GCCOG; Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy, GCCOG; Jerry Wood, GCCOG Engineer; Dave Randall, Transportation Director, Montebello Unified School District; Bob Eula, City of Commerce LAC; Mario Sotelo, City of Commerce LAC; Patricia Long, City of Long Beach CAC; Ken James, CSULB; Leo Rodriguez, CSULB; Ramon Grijalva, President, Addison Burnett Group; Elena Rodriguez, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma; Yuki Kidokoro, Southern California Program Director, Communities for a Better Environment; Joan Greenwood, Environmental Chair, Wrigley Area Neighborhood Alliance; Robert Cabrales, Community Organizer, Huntington Park; Isella Ramirez, Community Organizer, Commerce and East Los Angeles; Bob Stiles, CEO, Citi Car Co.; Jack Waldron, Project Manager, URS; Dave Levinsohn, Deputy Project Manager, URS; Shannon Willits, Engineering Manager, URS; Rob McCann, President, LSA; Jayna Goodman, Senior Planner, LSA; Pat McLaughlin, Principal, MIG; Esmeralda Garcia, Project Manager, MIG; Julia Lester, Environ International; Nancy Pfeffer, President, Network Public Affairs.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Mirabal led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

Yuki Kidokoro, Communities for a Better Environment, said that one person from Huntington Park had requested to be on the Huntington Park Local Advisory Committee but was told that the City was discouraged from forming a local committee. She said she was excited about the Air Quality Action Plan and would like a strong public participation in that process. She said the health impact assessment presented to the Corridor Advisory Committee was very good and encouraged that it be presented to the Project Committee.

Bob Stiles, CitiCar Company, said that a railroad system down the center of I-710 should be considered by the Project Committee.

VI. Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Aguilar, to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 29, 2009. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. Appointments

A. Consideration of Appointment of Southern California Edison Company and City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power as Ex Officio Members of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

The GCCOG Executive Director presented a staff report indicating the desire of the Southern California Edison Company and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to join the Project Committee as ex officio, non-voting members. He pointed out that their interest was generated by the hybrid design adopted for the project envisioned utilizing the power transmission rights of way of the two agencies. He said the Memorandum of Understanding among the participating agencies allowed for the addition of ex officio members upon approval of two-thirds of the Project Committee.

It was moved by Member Daniels, seconded by Member Gurule, to approve the addition of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power as an ex officio member of the Project Committee. The motion was approved unanimously.

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Walters, to approve the addition of the Southern California Edison Company as an ex officio member of the Project Committee. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. Consideration of Appointment of Three Members to the Environmental Subject Working Group

The GCCOG Executive Director reported that the COG had received requests from three individuals to be appointed to the Environmental Subject Working Group. He identified the three as Dr. Paul Simon of the Los Angeles County Department of Health, Andrea Hricko of the Environmental Health Sciences Center of the University of Southern California, and Alina Green of the Center for Occupational and Environmental Health of UCLA.

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Walters, to appoint Dr. Paul Simon, Andrea Hricko, and Alina Green to the Environmental Subject Working Group. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. Presentation

A. Los Angeles River Goods Movement Project

The GCCOG Executive Director introduced GCCOG Engineer Jerry Wood, who reported that various concepts have been put forward by private industry to move large numbers of containers to and from the San Pedro Bay ports along the I-710 corridor using innovative technologies. He reminded the Committee that presentations on several of these concepts had previously been received by the Project Committee.

Mr. Wood introduced Ramon Grijalva, President of the Addison Burnett Group, who made a presentation regarding a proposal to use alternative technology to transport cargo from the ports to the rail yards and other destinations along the corridor by using a system of barges and conveyers within the Los Angeles River.

Member Messina asked how far upriver the system would operate. Mr. Grijalva responded that it would go up to the City of Commerce. Member Messina asked how this would fit in with plans of the City of Los Angeles for beautifying the river. Mr. Grijalva responded that the portion of the river in the San Fernando Valley and the portion he is talking about can be beautified in different ways.

Member Gurule asked what would happen to the equipment when it rains. Mr. Grijalva responded that the barges would be taken off the conveyers and placed in yards on days rain is predicted.

Co-Chair Hurtado said that there has to be enough water depth to move the barges. He said that some of the bridges are on the low side in terms of along a barge in high water to pass. Mr. Grijalva said that he hadn't seen the Army Corps of Engineers' drawings. He said they were looking at barges perhaps being double stacked. He said the overcrossings appear to be at least 20 feet high, which should allow for passage. Co-Chair Hurtado asked if one conveyer would go upstream and the other downstream. Mr. Grijalva replied that barges would travel on one conveyer which does a loop. He said that they were not saying that this is a good idea, but that it is worth studying.

Member DeChellis asked if they had done hydraulic studies. Mr. Grijalva said that they have no budget for that.

Member Lopez-Mendoza asked if the concept was the same as that used in the Pirates of the Caribbean ride at Disneyland. Mr. Grijalva responded that it is. Member Lopez-Mendoza asked Mr. Grijalva to address the issues of noise and view. Mr. Grijalva said that their thinking is that from the side the barges would look something like the Catalina Express. He said they did not think the system would be noisier than that used by the Pirates of the Caribbean ride.

South Gate Councilmember Bill DeWitt asked if this project would require more water in the river and how that would be handled. Mr. Grijalva said that he did not know, but he would like to entertain a method of capturing storm water. He said another possibility would be to use seawater or brackish water.

Member Seamans asked what the timeline would be for this type of project. Mr. Grijalva responded that they would need to get wires down for

flood control purposes, so they can't extrapolate from other projects such as the Santa Ana River.

Member Lopez-Mendoza said she wanted the Committee to hear this presentation because it is so different from what ideas have been presented so far. She wanted the Committee to hear a different perspective.

Member Aguilar asked how containers intended for the Commerce rail yards would get there. Member Walters asked how the Los Angeles River can be dredged. Mr. Grijalva said that, to make this river navigable, it would have many policy ramifications.

It was moved by Member Daniels, seconded by Member Gurule, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

IX. Reports

A. Status Report on the I-710 Corridor EIR/EIS

1. Status Report—Engineering

Jack Waldron, URS Project Manager, reviewed the schedule and list of upcoming meetings and the status of the comments and responses on the geometric concept report. Mr. Waldron presented the preliminary results of the rail yard gate surveys.

Member Lopez-Mendoza asked whether the report's maps were for all alternatives or just for the Locally Preferred Alternative. Mr. Waldron replied that the maps are only for Alternative 6. He said the other alternatives would not be reflected on the maps. He said Alternative 5 would look the same on the maps except that it would be without the freight corridor.

Member Mirabal asked if they were extrapolating figures for the East Los Angeles rail yards from the gate surveys because the situation today is very different from last year. Mr. Waldron said the purpose of the gate surveys was meant more to determine origins and destinations of cargo rather than cargo volume.

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Daniels to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

2. Status Report—Environmental

Rob McCann, LSA, provided an update on the environmental studies. He summarized the reports that had been completed to date, including the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Protocols and the Greenhouse Gas Analysis Issues White Paper. It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member DuBois, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Status Report—Community Participation

Pat McLaughlin, MIG, presented an update on the community participation activity. She said the upcoming meetings list update would be placed on the project website in the near future. She reported that a final newsletter was almost completed.

Member Daniels said that he was very encouraged in hearing about the various outreach programs.

It was moved by Member Gurule, seconded by Member Forester, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. Alternative Screening Recommendations

Dave Levinsohn, URS, reviewed the alternatives that had been recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee and the Corridor Advisory Committee for further screening. The alternatives advanced by those two committees were: Alternative 1 (No Build); Alternative 5 (widen to 10 general purpose lanes without the freight corridor); Alternative 6A (widen to 10 general purpose lanes plus 4 freight movement lanes for conventional trucks); and Alternative 6B (widen to 10 general purpose lanes plus 4 freight movement lanes for zero emission trucks).

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member DuBois, to concur with the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee and Corridor Advisory Committee to proceed with Alternatives 1, 5, 6A, and 6B to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Member Lerch offered an amendment to the motion to say that the Project Committee preserves the ability to later scale down the alternatives. The amendment was accepted by Members Forester and DuBois. The motion, as amended, was approved, with Member Lopez-Mendoza opposed.

C. Refined Geometric Plans Presentation

Technical Advisory Committee Chairman Bill Pagett presented a report summarizing the refined geometric plans prepared for the Locally Preferred Strategy. He said these refined geometric plans had been submitted to the Technical Advisory Committee, Corridor Advisory Committee, and local advisory committees for review and comments. Mr.

Pagett said the refined geometric plans have concurrence from these various committees with more detailed analysis to follow during the environmental phase of the project.

It was moved by Member Lerch, seconded by Co-Chair Hurtado, to continue this item to the next meeting so that the Long Beach City Council could have time to review the refined geometric plans.

Jack Waldron, URS, said for the consultant team to stay on schedule it was necessary to move forward with the geometrics. He said a meeting could be scheduled with the Long Beach City Council.

Member Lerch and Co-Chair Hurtado withdrew their motion.

It was moved by Member Daniels, seconded by Member Mirabal, to concur with the recommendations from the local advisory committees, Corridor Advisory Committee, and the Technical Advisory Committee to process using the Refined Geometric Plan in the EIR/EIS analysis, subject to comments being addressed in the next phase and schedule of the process. The motion was approved, with Member Lerch opposed.

D. Air Quality Action Plan Update

Gateway Cities COG Executive Director Richard Powers presented a status report on the Air Quality Action Plan. He referred the Committee to the fact sheet contained in the agenda packet which summarized the Air Quality Action Plan's mission, status, and next steps. He said that funds in the amount of \$2 million had been reserved to complete the project and that the COG and MTA would be partnering on the effort.

Member Lopez-Mendoza asked if there is any role for this body to play in the Air Quality Action Plan. It was moved by Member Lopez-Mendoza, seconded by Member Aguirre, that a subcommittee be formed and that it be placed on the next agenda as an action item. The motion was approved unanimously.

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Gurule, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

X. Comments from Committee Members

Member Forester requested that a speaker card system be used for prospective speakers from the audience during public comments. Member Walter suggested that there be a three minute limit per speaker.

XI. Adjournment

It was moved by Member Gurule, seconded by Member Daniels, to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

VII. Appoint Additional Members to Committees

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives

SUBJECT: Appoint Additional Members to Committees

Background

Since the initial Project Committee appointments to the various committees, some positions have become open to some of the committees. The request from Los Angeles Unified School District for an appointment to the Environmental Subject Working Group is attached. A list of any other interested parties will be presented at the meeting for discussion by the Project Committee.

Recommended Action

Consideration of additional appointments to the committees or provide direction to staff.

Los Angeles Unified School District

Office of Environmental Health and Safety

RAMON C. CORTINES
Superintendent of Schools

DAVID HOLMQUIST
Chief Operating Officer

YIHWAN KIM
Interim Director

July 6, 2009

Mr. Ernest Morales
Project Director
Gateway Cities/Southeast Area Team
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-4
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: Official Participation in I-710 Environmental Subject Working Group

The proposed I-710 Corridor Project will expand the portion of the I-710 freeway from Ocean Boulevard in Long Beach to the junction with SR-60 in East Los Angeles, a distance of approximately 18 miles. Much of this project will be located within the boundaries of the Los Angeles Unified School District. This project may directly impact the siting decisions for our New School Construction Program and may potentially create or exacerbate environmental hazards for existing schools. One of the stated purposes of the project is to improve air quality and public health, in part through planning and dialogue of the Environmental Subject Working Group (ESWG).

Because the District is a significant stakeholder in any project that could affect the health of students and staff, and based on our experience at assessing health risks related to mobile emission sources, we are requesting that the District be officially represented in the I-710 ESWG. We look forward to actively participating in future discussions and hope our request will be granted. In the event of a favorable reply, my alternate designee will be Mr. Ian MacMillan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,


Pat Schanen
Deputy Director
Office of Environmental Health and Safety

VIII. I-710 Project Committee 2010 Meeting Schedule

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

SUBJECT: I-710 Project Committee Meeting Schedule for 2010

Background

The Project Committee had previously decided to meet quarterly, to date on the fifth Thursday every three months. In 2010 this type of schedule may not be possible and the Project Committee needs to review dates and determine the meeting schedule for 2010.

Following are the 2010 5th Thursday dates for consideration: April 29, July 29, September 30 and December 30, 2010.

Recommended Action

Select dates for quarterly meetings in 2010.

IX. REPORTS

Item A

Status report on I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

- 1. Engineering**
- 2. Environmental**
- 3. Community Participation**

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: Status Reports on I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

Background

An up-to-date status report on the work initiated to date will be presented. This includes engineering, environmental and community participation. The project has been underway for about one and one-half years and is currently on schedule. The schedule will also be discussed along with a 3-month look ahead for each of these areas. Materials and reports that summarize the various tasks and studies that have been completed to date will be distributed at the meeting. The project is moving into the environmental analysis phase of the work.

Summary Reports

1. Engineering
2. Environmental
3. Community Participation

Recommended Action

Receive and File Status Reports

IX. REPORTS

Item B

Updated Ports' Cargo Forecast Presentation

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Ports' Representative

SUBJECT: Updated Ports' Cargo Forecast Presentation

Background

The Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles have recently updated their cargo forecasts and will make a presentation on the results to the Project Committee.

Recommended Action

Receive and File Report

IX. REPORTS

Item C

**Air quality Action Plan Update and
Review of “Draft” Scope of Work by
Gateway Cities COG Staff**

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director of Gateway Cities COG

BY: Gateway Cities COG Staff

SUBJECT: Air Quality Action Plan Update and Review of “Draft” Scope of Work by Gateway Cities COG Staff

Background

When the Major Corridor Study was completed and adopted by the Oversight Policy Committee (OPC) in November, 2004, the number one remaining issue was air quality and health. In recognition of that, the OPC requested that the Gateway Cities COG (COG) move forward with an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) for the corridor. The COG will provide and update and status for this plan at the meeting. Also, “draft” scope of work to prepare the AQAP has been prepared and has been reviewed with others and is attached as Attachment A for review and concurrence by the Project Committee.

Recommended Action

1. Receive and File Status Report; and 2. Concur with “Draft” Scope of Work; and/or Give Direction to Staff

ATTACHMENT A

**“DRAFT”
SCOPE OF WORK
FOR**

**GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN**

OCTOBER, 2009

Table of Contents
Air Quality Action Plan

SECTION A.	INTRODUCTION/PROJECT BACKGROUND/OTHER STUDIES.....	23
SECTION C.	PURPOSE AND NEED AND GOALS.....	27
SECTION D.	COORDINATION	29
SECTION E.	RESOURCE MATERIAL.....	30
SECTION F.	PROJECT OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION	31
1.	CONTRACT AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT	31
2.	AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN	31
3.	PUBLIC AGENCY AND STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION.....	31
SECTION G.	SCOPE OF WORK.....	32
1.	PROJECT MANAGEMENT	32
2.	COMPENDIUM UPDATE.....	33
a.	<i>Data and Resource Material Collection and Review</i>	<i>33</i>
b.	<i>Additional Research</i>	<i>33</i>
c.	<i>Interviews</i>	<i>34</i>
d.	<i>Compendium Update</i>	<i>34</i>
e.	<i>Framework Reporting Format Development.....</i>	<i>34</i>
f.	<i>Protocols Development.....</i>	<i>34</i>
g.	<i>Compendium Report.....</i>	<i>35</i>
3.	QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS	35
4.	DEVELOPMENT OF HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT.....	37
a.	<i>Methodology Development.....</i>	<i>38</i>
b.	<i>Development of Appropriate Emissions Inventory</i>	<i>38</i>
c.	<i>Development of Air Dispersion Model</i>	<i>38</i>
d.	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>39</i>
e.	<i>Development of Review Process with Agencies, Stakeholders and Public Input.....</i>	<i>40</i>
f.	<i>Draft and Final Reports</i>	<i>40</i>
5.	DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIES TO ENSURE AIR QUALITY BENEFITS TO I-710 CORRIDOR COMMUNITIES.....	40
a.	<i>Prioritize 3rd Party Measures</i>	<i>41</i>
b.	<i>Develop Draft Policies and Programs for 3rd Party Measures Monitoring and Evaluations</i>	<i>41</i>
6.	DEVELOPMENT OF NEW AIR QUALITY MEASURES	41
a.	<i>Meetings with Others.....</i>	<i>42</i>
b.	<i>Development of Concepts for New Air Quality Measures</i>	<i>42</i>
c.	<i>Quantitative Analysis.....</i>	<i>42</i>
d.	<i>Draft and Final Reports</i>	<i>42</i>
7.	EARLY ACTION ITEMS SUPPORT	42
a.	<i>Local Communities Assistance</i>	<i>43</i>
8.	DEVELOPMENT OF THE ACTION PLAN	43
9.	PUBLIC AND COMMUNITIES OUTREACH.....	44
a.	<i>Comprehensive Database of Stakeholders</i>	<i>44</i>
b.	<i>Communication Mechanisms Development.....</i>	<i>44</i>
c.	<i>Regular Meetings/Presentations.....</i>	<i>44</i>
d.	<i>Public Meetings.....</i>	<i>44</i>
10.	FINAL AQAP REPORT	45
11..	DELIVERABLES.....	45
12.	SCHEDULE.....	45

SECTION A. INTRODUCTION/PROJECT BACKGROUND/OTHER STUDIES

A Major Corridor Study was completed for the I-710 freeway in 2004. The Study Area for that study is shown on Figure 1. With the approval of the Locally Preferred Strategy that minimized residential property impacts, which is summarized in Figure 1, the number one remaining issue was air quality and health of the residents in the I-710 Corridor. Therefore, the Major Corridor Study was approved by the Oversight Policy Committee (OPC) with the following condition:

That the Gateway Cities Council of Governments return with suggested steps for initiating the development and implementation of a corridor level Air Quality Action Plan to include not only technical, but also funding, institutional structure and legislative strategies as well as an approach for holding public agencies with jurisdiction in the Corridor accountable for progress in meeting air quality and public health objectives in the Corridor and Region.










To accomplish this, the AQAP would be designed with the following elements:

1. Data collection of existing studies and review, including status with detailed analysis
2. Evaluating and analyzing existing studies and programs
3. Advocating for adequate funding from all sources for air quality improvement programs
4. Monitoring existing programs for strategies, progress and effectiveness to quantify the potential air quality benefits of these programs for GCCOG area that have substantial or moderate benefits
5. Reporting function for elected officials, staff and communities
6. Suggestions for existing or additional air quality programs (e.g., additional air monitoring stations in the I-710 corridor) to achieve additional air quality improvements, based on a quantified study
7. Advocating for health related issues and programs
8. Providing testimony and input to other agencies
9. Developing a priority list of near-term air quality strategies that will be monitored twice each year for progress with specific status reports of time-lines, time-tables, funding, status, benefits and issues.
10. Working with local communities to implement local air quality improvement strategies and programs
11. Participating in air quality programs where applicable
12. Determining health risks and benefits of the air quality improvements plans for the residents in the I-710 Corridor, including development of a sub-regional Health Risk Assessment to evaluate the public health benefit of the full implementation of the air quality measures included in the AQAP.

2008

I-710 Major Corridor Study Hybrid Design Concept

- 10 General Purpose Lanes
- Freight Movement Corridor
- Interchange Improvements

LEGEND	
	Add One Mixed Flow Lane (Each Direction)
	Add Two Mixed Flow Lanes (Each Direction)
	Freight Movement Corridor
	Interchange Improvement
	New Interchange
	Eliminate Interchange
	Interchange to be studied to remain open
	Direct rail yard access
	Truck Ingress/Egress

Preliminary Concepts, Subject to Change



Source: Jerry Wood, Consultant, in association with MMA, Inc. and Nolan Consulting, Inc., April 2004, Updated April, 2006

FIGURE 1

**I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009**

In response to the request of the I-710 OPC, Gateway Cities developed the following:

1. Developed a Compendium of Existing and Proposed Near-Term Air Quality Improvement Strategies for the I-710 Corridor – March, 2006
2. Prepared an update, status and estimated schedule of Existing and Proposed Near-Term Air Quality Improvement Strategies for the I-710 Corridor in September, 2006
3. Developed the report – “Development of the Air Quality Action Plan for the I-710 Corridor”, which was completed in June, 2007. This report included interviews with various officials and groups, early action projects recommended by the environmental community, a proposed scope of work for the AQAP, and an update of existing and proposed near-term air quality strategies. It summarized the process that resulted in the creation of the AQAP and the expectations that stakeholders have for the AQAP.
4. Developed an air quality plan for the I-710 EIR/EIS, which also included a health risk assessment (the first of its kind for a major freeway corridor). That plan, with its health risk assessment, is being prepared in 2009, including protocols for green house gases and climate change emissions analyses.
5. Secured federal funds in 2008 for funding for the AQAP and initiated the process of preparing the scope of work to retain consultants to proceed with the AQAP in 2009.

The preceding list of other studies and efforts represent the initial resource documents to be used for the AQAP. The purpose of this scope of work is to retain consultants to prepare the AQAP, based on the previous efforts and the enclosed scope of work.

SECTION B. PROJECT AREA/LIMITS

The Study Area for this effort is represented by the area shown in Figure 1. This is basically along the I-710 freeway corridor. However, air dispersion modeling will be prepared as part of the AQAP and it is likely that the study area boundaries could increase to include the area between I-110 to the I-605 in an east/west direction. That will be determined as the AQAP study progresses as determined by the consultant and other inputs from agencies and stakeholders.

The consultant will define, along with other agencies and studies, the zone of impacts for criteria pollutant concentrations and health risks for sensitive receptors (e.g., SCAQMD guideline: cancer risk > 1 in a million). To determine this, the consultant will perform initial dispersion model runs using a coarse receptor grid to investigate the extent of the zone of impact within the study area. This will be based on, initially, the I-710 being in the center with west/east boundaries of I-110 and I-605 and south/north boundaries of the two ports and the SR-60 freeway.

SECTION C. PURPOSE AND NEED AND GOALS

Interstate I-710 (I-710) is a major north-south interstate freeway connecting the City of Long Beach to the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles to central Los Angeles with connections to I-405, SR-91, I-105, I-5, SR-60 and I-10. An EIR/EIS to improve this freeway is currently underway and scheduled to be completed in 2011.

The Study Area for the I-710 EIR/EIS is shown in Figure 1. When the Major Corridor Study was completed for the I-710 freeway in 2004, the communities completed their own report, entitled Tier 2 CAC Report. Both of these reports and studies determined that air quality and health issues are the number one priority to be analyzed to determine how to improve the I-710 freeway.

Exposure to diesel exhaust matter along I-710 comes from both on-road and off-road engine exhaust that is either directly emitted from the engines or aged through lingering in the atmosphere. This is of concern because I-710 is a major route that is heavily utilized by heavy-duty diesel truck traffic traveling to and from the POLB and POLA. Diesel exhaust contains more than 40 toxic air contaminants. These include many known or suspected cancer-causing substances, such as benzene, arsenic, formaldehyde, and nickel. The sizes of diesel particulate matter (DPM) that are of greatest health concern are those that are in the categories of fine and ultrafine particles. Diesel exhaust particles and gases are suspended in the air, so exposure occurs whenever a person breathes air that contains these substances. With improvements to I-710, exposure of humans to DPM may decrease. So the primary objective of improvements to the I-710 freeway and in the corridor is to improve air quality and public health.

However, the I-710 Air Quality component of the EIR/EIS is limited to only examining air quality issues as it relates to the project. The air quality analysis component of the I-710 EIR/EIS will only examine impacts of related projects in the corridor based on a qualitative analysis. Therefore, the scope of that study is limited. The AQAP to be prepared for the I-710 Corridor addresses this issue by performing a quantitative analysis of the impacts of all of the other related projects and air quality improvements in the study area and being able to assess their results and evaluate other options and ideas. That is beyond the scope of the air quality plan for the I-710 EIR/EIS. These other projects include all projects in the ports, rail yards, rail operations, industrial projects, oil refineries, other transportation projects, general industry, other known or identified sources of air pollution in the study area in Figure 1 (or the zone of impacts that is developed). It will include all mobile and point sources of interest within the study area. This analysis will examine all pollution sources and measures to reduce pollution levels along with health impacts associated with air pollution in the study area.

One of the goals of the AQAP is to evaluate current and projected (2035) ambient air concentrations from 3rd party air quality improvement measures for criteria pollutants in the study area. Criteria pollutants are associated with adverse health effects. Another goal is the preparation of a health risk assessment for the study area to evaluate current and projected health risks from air toxics after implementation of 3rd party air quality measures within the study area.

**I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009**

A further goal of the AQAP is also to prepare calculations for pollutants from 3rd party air quality improvement measures for the project year (2035). This includes quantifying emissions from the source(s) being analyzed (from existing information) and then determining the future concentrations at receptor locations in the study area. This will be achieved by combining emissions with meteorological data in an air dispersion model to simulate how the pollutants are transported and mixed/dispersed from the sources to their surroundings in the study area. Based on these analyses, criteria pollutants' concentrations will be compared to ambient air quality standards. TACs will be further assessed by combining their concentrations with information about human exposure pathway and duration as well as toxicity for each TAC to estimate the health impacts or risks. The health impacts from all TACs will be added together to obtain a collective impact from all TACs included in the analysis.

Another goal of the AQAP is development of additional air quality improvement measures and strategies if additional air quality improvements are needed to be achieved. The final goal of the AQAP is an actionable plan of specific implementation steps to achieve the air quality improvement outcomes determined from this study.

SECTION D. COORDINATION

Extensive coordination is required for the preparation of the AQAP. This will be included in the scope of work and will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA)
- Gateway Cities Council of Governments Board of Directors
- South Coast Air Quality District
- California Air Resources Board,
- California EPA
- EPA
- Caltrans
- Local Communities
- Stakeholders and Environmental Groups
- Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles

The scope of work will include extensive coordination with all these groups by the consultant during the preparation of the AQAP.

It will be essential for the consultant to remain in close communication with MTA and the GCCOG and the board of directors regarding progress that is being made on the development of the AQAP. This coordination will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Bi-weekly conference calls and/or meetings with MTA and GCCOG Staffs
- Quarterly meetings with MTA and GCCOG Staffs
- Providing regular briefings on the status of the project
- Quarterly reports on the status of the project
- Frequent meetings with the participating agencies listed above (at least one per quarter)

SECTION E. RESOURCE MATERIAL

The resource material will include, but not limited to, the following:

1. Compendium of Existing and Proposed Near-Term Air Quality Improvement Strategies for the I-710 Corridor – March, 2006
2. Update, status and estimated schedule of Existing and Proposed Near-Term Air Quality Improvement Strategies for the I-710 Corridor in September, 2006
3. Development of the Air Quality Action Plan for the I-710 Corridor”, which was completed in June, 2007**.
4. Air quality plan for the I-710 EIR/EIS, which also included a health risk assessment (the first of its kind for a major freeway corridor)*.
5. Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles Clean Air Action Plan
6. SCAQMD AQMP
7. Rail Yards’ Air Quality and Health Risk Assessments by CARB and rail companies
8. SCAG air quality studies
9. AQMD Land Use Handbook

The preceding form the basis of resource material to be used for the AQAP. Additional studies, reports and information will be obtained by the consultant to supplement the lists above for these other studies, reports and information that would apply to the study area shown in Figure 1.

* - The I-710 Air Quality documents, studies and information are in the process of being prepared. They have established protocols, models, limits and pollutants to be studied. These studies should provide the primary guidance and input for the AQAP.

** - The consultant shall base his approach and work using all the material in this report to help define the scope of work.

SECTION F. PROJECT OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION

Section 1.01 1. Contract and Project Management

The consultant will be under contract with MTA, in partnership with GCCOG. In addition SCAG and the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles may also make contributions and provide some participation. In addition, the air quality agencies (such as CARB, SCAQMD, EPA, etc.) along with other stakeholders will also be participating in this effort and providing information, input, reviews and comments. The MTA project manager will be responsible for managing the overall terms and conditions of the contract. This will include all schedules, deliverables compliance, and any direction to the consultant. Any changes in scope of work, time tables, deliverables, etc. will have to be approved by MTA project manager before proceeding.

Section 1.02 2. Air Quality Action Plan

The MTA and the GCCOG along with the other agencies listed above will have input into the AQAP and the consultant should assume time and budget to respond to the comments and requests of these other agencies.

Section 1.03 3. Public Agency and Stakeholder Coordination

The primary agency will be the MTA, being the contract agency, in partnership with the GCCOG. Other public agencies will participate as their interests occur. The consultant should plan on frequent meetings with these public agencies. The frequency of these meetings will be determined at project initiation. It should be assumed that a working group of these other agencies and interested groups may be formed to provide input, oversight and provide a forum for review and comments.

SECTION G. SCOPE OF WORK

Section 1.04 1. Project Management

The consultant will provide the necessary project management for the duration of the project. These services include initiation, planning, execution, control, quality control and close-out for the final report. An introductory meeting with the project team of the partnering agencies will be held within 15 calendar days of the notice to proceed. A schedule showing the critical path identifying all critical steps and tasks will be submitted to the project team within 30 days of Notice to Proceed. This will be reviewed by the project team who will provide comments to the consultant as soon as possible in order to validate the planning and cost control procedures within the first calendar month of the project. This task will also include ongoing coordination and communication with the project team and the consultant (and any sub-consultants). A work plan will be submitted that will detail the scope, project costs, schedule and milestones. All project deliverables will be sent to the project manager for the MTA.

Deliverables will include, but not be limited to:

- Draft Invoice
- Schedule
- Work Plan
- Resource material preliminary review and comments
- File Maintenance
- Communications and coordination with project team and between consultants (letters, memos, minutes, etc.)
- Any coordination with sub-consultants

Project Management will also include the process of coordinating people and other resources to carry out the project and ensure that all the component objectives are being met by monitoring and taking corrective action as necessary. Monthly progress meetings will be held between the project team and the consultant as the work progresses to discuss the work progress, potential problems, plans for the next period and any other progress issues. These dates and times will be established between the consultant and the project team. An agenda and any other materials for these meetings will be provided by the consultant a minimum of three (3) days before each meeting. The consultant will prepare meeting minutes and submit for review and comment with seven (7) calendar days of the meeting. The minutes shall indicate issues discussed and the resolution or action required resolving any issues. Each meeting will also include a four-week look ahead schedule and discussion.

Two sets of project files will be maintained: one set on site with the consultant and the other set updated monthly and delivered to the MTA project manager. The consultant

shall hand over all project files, Geographic Information System (GIS) map files and the administrative record to the MTA project manager at the completion of the project.

Deliverables will include:

- Project Invoices
- Progress Reports
- Agendas and minutes for monthly progress meetings
- Project schedule and any updates

Section 1.05 2. Compendium Update

(a) a. Data and Resource Material Collection and Review

A crucial aspect of the development of the AQAP will be a detailed analysis of the air quality impacts of the measures that have been or will be implemented by the ARB, SCAQMD, SPBPs that are included in their studies for the resource material to be used for the AQAP. This analysis will focus on the extent to which the emission reductions that are attributable to the measures being deployed by these other agencies will accrue to the I-710 Corridor communities. This analysis will enable the consultant to evaluate the measures to determine which of these will have the most beneficial impact on the I-710 Corridor communities, which in turn will help the consultant and the stakeholders make decisions about which of these measures to prioritize for additional work.

In order to perform the analysis, an update of the two compendiums of air quality improvement projects and programs that were previously listed has to be done. That is the function of this task. The first element of this task will be collection of existing data and resource material that will be used to update the compendium. This would include all the studies and other information included in the two previous compendiums and the AQAP Development Plan Report.

(b) b. Additional Research

In addition, there will likely be additional and new studies and information that has been developed since the resource material listed in Section E. was developed. The consultant will perform the necessary research to determine and obtain this new and additional information for air quality improvements and programs. This would include, for example, the air quality plan being prepared for the I-710 EIR/EIS, the air quality studies and health risk assessments done for the rail yards in the study area and the EIR/EIS (including air quality plan and health risk assessment prepared Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project.

(c) c. Interviews

In order to assure that all current information has been updated and collected, the consultant will conduct interviews with the staffs of the agencies that have been identified. The interviews will be done, in part, to assure that all current, relevant information is obtained and used for this task. This would include status reports for the various air pollution improvements programs and regulations. These interviews will include additional air quality measures that have been proposed by 3rd parties which should be included in the analysis.

(d) d. Compendium Update

Once the initial sub-tasks listed above are completed, the consultant will update the compendium to bring it up to date. The compendium will be expanded to include time tables and expected air quality improvements (including any health risk assessments) from the programs included in it.

The Compendium will include a summary, review, synopsis and analyses of the resource material previously listed and all other reports and data that have also been collected regarding mobile and point source air pollution levels and local health indicators from existing and future air port activity, shipping and trucking activity, rail activity, industry, etc. in the study area and the potential health impacts and effects of air pollution on the communities in the study area.

(e) e. Framework Reporting Format Development

A framework will be developed in this sub-task for reporting the results that will provide data in a manner most useful to the stakeholders in the I-710 program. The consultant will work with the stakeholders to determine the framework and format that best suits the needs of those who will be using the information to make decisions, set priorities and for other uses.

(f) f. Protocols Development

Meetings will be held with SPBPs, CARB and SCAQMD to develop the appropriate protocols for the evaluation of air quality benefits of the air improvement measures in the I-710 Corridor. It will be important for the consultant to work with these agencies to ensure that all parties agree with the methodologies that will be used to calculate the emission reductions of measures and to attribute a portion of those reductions to the I-710 Corridor communities.

The protocols development will include the following:

- Baseline
- Approach for Criteria Pollutant Emission Calculations
- Approach for Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) Emissions Calculations
- Approach for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Calculations
- Dispersion Modeling(s) Selections for Criteria Pollutant Impacts and TACs Concentrations
- Conformity Assessment Approach for CO and PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}
- Health Risk Assessment
- PM Mortality (qualitative approach only)
- Significance and Conformity Determinations Approach

(g) g. Compendium Report

At the conclusion of this task, the consultant will prepare a report that will include the following:

- Summary of Collected information and results of additional research
- Results of the interviews (minutes of meetings)
- Update Compendium of Air Quality Strategies, including analysis of anticipated air quality improvements and community effects
- Reporting Framework
- Protocols Development

The consultant will prepare both draft and final reports to be processed and reviewed by all participants coordinated with during this task.

Section 1.06 3. Quantitative Analysis

This task includes a quantitative analysis and evaluation of the total expected air quality impacts and benefits of the measures included in the updated compendium (including analysis of future, possible air quality improvements such as using zero emission methods to move containers in the I-710 corridor). This analysis would determine the impacts and benefits of these air quality measures for the I-710 Corridor communities and will follow guidance as accepted as State of the Art. The baseline year for any comparisons will be 2009.

This analysis should include an analysis of criteria pollutants as well as greenhouse gas emissions. Air quality guidance is to be based on Caltrans requirements but supplemented with guidance, determined during protocol development, with other agencies such as CARB, AQMD, CalEPA and USEPA.

Criteria pollutants to be analyzed will include:

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x), including Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)
- Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)
- Particulate Matter < 10 microns (PM₁₀) and 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5})
- Sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and Sulfates (SO₄)

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) will also be analyzed and include the 6 MSATs as a minimum.

In addition, Greenhouse Gases (GHG) will be analyzed, including:

- Carbon Dioxide (CO₂)
- Methane (CH₄)
- Nitrous Oxide (N₂O)

The AQAP should also sharpen the evaluation of the value of each of these measures to the I-710 Corridor communities and reported as follows: substantial, moderate, limited or none. The analysis should also analyze and determine the timetables for results and it should include a cost effectiveness analysis of the measures, particularly as it pertains to emission reductions that will take place in the I-710 Corridor.

The analysis will evaluate the changes from 3rd party air quality measures in:

- Criteria pollutant and toxic emissions
- Criteria pollutant concentrations levels (air quality)

It will include emissions quantification resulting from all 3rd party measures in the study area (including I-710 improvements) and conformity analyses for PM and CO, including local “hot spot” dispersion modeling for CO and full dispersion modeling for air quality analysis.

The consultant will identify the model(s) to be used, developed in concert with air agencies, and then develop a final list of criteria pollutants and the guidance(s) to be followed for all analyses from different agencies.

The air quality analysis will include:

1. Reviews of the guidance’s in effect, and along with the previous research, provide a paper recommending a course of analysis for addressing both Air Quality and a Health Risk Assessment.
2. Using existing sources of information, describe the existing air quality and pollutants in the study area which are in non-attainment.
3. Document planning assumptions (transportation as well as other projects for 3rd parties) and emission models to be used as the latest available and approved through interagency consultation.

4. The consultant will collect current ambient air quality data from the nearest Air Resources Board and Air Pollution Control District sites plus data from sites from the two ports.
5. For transportation related 3rd party projects, the consultant will obtain and review relevant traffic models and results and incorporate into air quality modeling.
6. Quantitative development and discuss impacts of 3rd party air quality measures in the study area. Coordinate results with AQMD Air Quality Plan or other Air Quality Plans or improvements for the study area.
7. An analysis should also be prepared for CO “hot spots” based on input from other studies.
8. CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} hot spot analyses will be required and prepared.
9. The consultant will coordinate the analysis results for conformity status with Federal Clean Air Act and coordinate with regional and air quality agencies on conformity status and define additional conformity related activities or analyses. Provide documentation of all of these coordination efforts.

The analysis will also include documenting and identifying the control mitigation measures from 3rd parties and other emission reduction programs related to CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} and their effectiveness in reducing emissions and achieving conformity.

The impacts of different pollutants will be evaluated against a benchmark (determined from consultations with air agencies). This will be a comparison to some reference value for a specific impact. These will be determined in consultations with air agencies to determine the form of limits, standards, thresholds, or comparisons to impacts of differing projects. These can be different for each pollutant and will be determined by the consultant. “Significance thresholds” will be determined by the consultant in consultations with air agencies.

The draft quantitative analysis of these 3rd party air quality measures will be distributed, after review by MTA and GCCOG, to selected peer reviews, including key staff at local air quality public agencies, as well as to the stakeholders in the I-710 Corridor for review and comment.

Once the comments have been received (and meetings held to review), the draft analysis will be finalized with the necessary revisions for this task for presentation to the MTA and the GCCOG.

Section 1.07 4. Development of Health Risk Assessment

Health risk assessments are extremely useful tools for the evaluation of both existing and public health threats as well as the potential benefit of future action. They can provide both policy makers and the general public with valuable information regarding which air quality improvement measures may yield the biggest reduction in risk to public health. It is therefore important to understand what the benefit will be to the I-710 Corridor communities of the many measures listed in the compendiums and the report as well as others that might be developed by the AQAP process. This task focuses on the

preparation of a health risk assessment for the Subregion that evaluates the reduction in public health risk of the AQAP. It includes the following subtasks:

(a) a. Methodology Development

(1) Resource Material Collection, Research and Review

Since the approval of the I-710 Major Corridor Study, many agencies have prepared health risk assessments for projects in the study area. The consultant will research this information and obtain the relevant health risk assessments and studies that have been performed by others. The consultant will review and report on the results of this research and summarize this information.

(2) Coordination with Other Agencies

This task will include coordinating with other agencies that have performed these other health risk assessments. The coordination will include coordinating with these other agencies to develop the subsequent guidelines.

(3) Methodology Development

(a) Draft and Final Reports

This sub-task will include the development of a methodology for assessing health risk, in accordance with the guidelines from other appropriate agencies as developed in the previous sub-task.

(b) b. Development of Appropriate Emissions Inventory

This sub-task will include the development of an appropriate emissions inventory that takes into account the projected emission reductions from the air quality programs and regulations included in the updated compendium and any others that may be developed and implemented as a result of this AQAP process.

(c) c. Development of Air Dispersion Model

The health risk assessment will include the selection of and use of the appropriate air dispersion mode for the zone of impact determined from a coarse receptor grid analysis previously described. This model will be chosen in concert with the air quality agencies that have been coordinated with in previous tasks. Final model run will use both fine receptor grid and discrete receptors within the identified zone of impact. Receptor grid is defined as residential and worker incremental risks. Sensitive receptors include day care centers, schools, convalescent homes, hospitals, etc.

(d) d. Analysis

The information obtained for the health risk assessment and the air dispersion model will be used to perform the analysis and determinations of health risks of the 3rd party air quality measures included in the updated compendium. The health risks will be developed and analyzed for Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) for:

- Diesel PM (DPM)
- Six MSATs

Full dispersion modeling will be used and human health risk assessments for all identified TACs resulting from implementing all 3rd party air quality measures.

The health risk assessment will evaluate the changes from 3rd party air quality measures for:

- Cancer risks and non-cancer health impacts from toxins
- PM_{2.5} mortality and morbidity impacts

The health risk assessment will also include:

- Review and documentation of existing health issues (including verification of figures and information)
- Collection of previous health studies applicable to the study area
- Methodology will be submitted to GCCOG, other participating agencies, CARB and AQMD for review and comment
- Determination of criteria and approval to develop and analyze health risks using air quality study and relevant traffic models study results
- Sufficient level of effort necessary to establish the protocols and approach for the Health Risk Assessment, including obtaining approval of all applicable agencies

The health risk assessment will also document the identified health risks against recognized federal, state, regional, local and professions standards, all according to available health risk guidelines. The health risk will also include the following:

1. A detailed report on all findings, including data compilation and research and results of modeling
2. Estimates of potential health effects
3. Summary and references of all studies and data used, meetings, and a summary of any other relevant discussions or findings related to the study
4. Recommendations for further action as outlined herein, including suggestions and impacts of land use decisions

(e) e. Development of Review Process with Agencies, Stakeholders and Public Input

This sub-task will also include a creation of a public input mechanism so that discrete localized risks can be identified and evaluated and so that an effective program(s) can be developed to communicate the results of this portion of the study to the general public. This sub-task will also include development of a review process with other agencies and stakeholders as well.

(f) f. Draft and Final Reports

A draft report will be prepared and circulated to other agencies and stakeholders, after review and comment by GCCOG. After comments are received, the revisions will be included in the report and it will be finalized for presentation to the GCCOG Board of Directors.

Section 1.08 5. Development of Strategies to Ensure Air Quality Benefits to I-710 Corridor Communities

The primary purpose of the this task is to determine what, if any, steps the I-710 Corridor communities can take to ensure that the air quality benefit of the measures from the previous tasks accrue to their community. For instance, measures that provide a requirement that trucks be outfitted with diesel emission control devices may eventually bring emission reductions to the I-710 Corridor communities, but these reductions can both be accelerated and enhanced if local governments worked to encourage early compliance. Similarly, if authorities establish new emission standards for off-road heavy duty equipment, I-710 Corridor communities can ensure that these reductions occur quickly in their communities by developing ordinances that require the use of the cleanest technology on construction projects within their jurisdiction. Conversely, there is little that I-710 Corridor communities can do to encourage owners of ocean going vessels to comply with speed reduction or lower sulfur fuel use requirements. However, the I-710 Corridor communities can create an advocacy program to support these measures with their elected officials.

Therefore, part of the purpose of the AQAP will be to identify opportunities based on the results of the previous tasks to accelerate the implementation of these 3rd party measures in the I-710 Corridor communities and develop model policies that local governments can approve which would accomplish this objective. In order to accomplish this, the consultant will implement the following:

(a) a. Prioritize 3rd Party Measures

Based on the results of the preceding tasks, the consultant, in cooperation with other agencies and stakeholders, work to prioritize 3rd party measures, highlighting those which both maximize the benefit in the I-710 Corridor and for which communities can implement policies that would accelerate or enhance the implementation of the measures for the I-710 Corridor communities. In addition, the consultant will work with the stakeholders to determine which measures should be prioritized for policy development, and for the development of timelines for implementation.

(b) b. Develop Draft Policies and Programs for 3rd Party Measures Monitoring and Evaluations

With this sub-task, the consultant will develop draft policies and programs, working with other agencies and stakeholders that can be implemented by I-710 Corridor communities that would accelerate and/or enhance the effectiveness of 3rd party air quality improvement measures in the I-710 Corridor.

The consultant will also evaluate the selected measures for cost effectiveness, including estimates of direct and indirect health and economic costs. It will be important for local decision makers to have information regarding which of the possible policies and programs that have been developed will result in the most local emission for the investment.

c. Draft and Final Reports

The consultant will prepare draft and final reports for review and comments.

Section 1.09 6. Development of New Air Quality Measures

The air quality measures that have been developed the last few years by the air quality regulators and the two ports will achieve substantial improvements in air quality. However, additional steps will likely be needed to be taken to reduce emissions of harmful air pollutants in order for the region to achieve health-based air quality standards. Most of these as of yet undefined measures are likely to be developed and implemented by the air quality agencies, there may be actions that can be taken (or supported by) on the local level that can contribute to additional air quality improvements in the I-710 Corridor. For this task, the consultant will focus on the development of new air quality improvement measures that can be implemented in the corridor and/or by the I-710 Corridor communities, including advocacy by I-710 stakeholders among air quality regulators for quicker implementation. One of these new measures will include analyzing the existing air quality monitoring stations in the I-710 Corridor, determining

the benefits of additional air quality monitoring stations and developing a plan for implementation. In addition, this task would also include the following:

(a) a. Meetings with Others

(b)

The consultant will meet with air quality agencies, key I-710 Corridor stakeholders, and others to brainstorm ideas for additional or new local air quality improvement measures.

(c) b. Development of Concepts for New Air Quality Measures

The consultant will develop concepts for new air quality improvement measures. This information will be circulated to air quality agencies and key I-710 Corridor stakeholders for review and comment. After review, the consultant will work with these others to prioritize these new air quality measures.

(d) c. Quantitative Analysis

The consultant will prepare a quantitative analysis of these new air quality measures to estimate the potential emission reductions and determine cost and cost-effectiveness.

(e) d. Draft and Final Reports

The consultant will prepare draft and final reports for review and comments.

Section 1.10 7. Early Action Items Support

Previous efforts working with representatives of the local communities resulted in them recommending nine recommendations for actions that I-710 Corridor stakeholders could take in the near term that advance the goals of the AQAP. These recommendations, potentially, could either reduce emissions directly or help prepare local communities for the implementation of other important emission reduction policies. The consultant shall follow-up with these recommendations and facilitate their implementation of those early action items which are approved by the GCCOG Board of Directors. This subtask includes:

(a) a. Local Communities Assistance

The consultant will work with local governments to determine what support is needed to ensure the successful implementation of the supported early action items. The next steps that result from this AQAP will include the consultant developing a plan to provide requested support, including a projected budget, menu of deliverables, and timelines for implementation.

Section 1.11 8. Development of the Action Plan

The results from the preceding tasks will be coalesced into an action plan of specific actions and steps to be taken to implement the plan. Consideration for the definition of these steps will take into consideration the following, as a minimum:

- Recommendations from the updated compendium of 3rd party air quality improvement measures.
- Results of the preceding sub-tasks
- Recommendations from other sources, stakeholders and agencies (including AQMD, CARB, the ports, the Tier 2 report, etc.)
- New legislation such as SB375 and AB32 that would affect air quality and land use
- New promulgated regulations

Some specific implementation steps would include but, not be limited to, the following:

1. Continuing data collection of existing studies and review, including status with detailed analysis
2. Evaluating and analyzing existing studies and programs with an evaluation of status and progress
3. Advocating for adequate funding from all sources for air quality improvement programs
4. Monitoring existing programs for strategies, progress and effectiveness to quantify the potential air quality benefits of these programs for GCCOG area that have substantial or moderate benefits
5. Reporting function for elected officials, staff and communities
6. Tracking additional air quality programs (e.g., additional air monitoring stations in the I-710 corridor) to achieve additional air quality improvements
7. Advocating for health related issues and programs
8. Providing testimony and input to other agencies
9. Updating the priority list of near-term air quality strategies that will be monitored twice each year for progress with specific status reports of time-lines, time-tables, funding, status, benefits and issues.
10. Working with local communities to implement local air quality improvement strategies and programs
11. Participating in air quality programs where applicable

The consultant will develop specific tasks as next steps that would result in the implementation of the plan.

Section 1.12 9. Public and Communities Outreach

The success of the AQAP will, in large part, depend on the education and engagement of the public. The consultant will develop and implement an approved public and communities outreach program at the initiation of this assignment through its completion. This outreach program will provide communities information on the AQAP and which also encourages input from stakeholders and the communities. The following subtasks are included:

(a) a. Comprehensive Database of Stakeholders

The consultant will develop and maintain a comprehensive database of stakeholders. This database should include all individuals and organizations that have participated at any time in the I-710 Corridor process since the inception of the Major Corridor Study. The consultant will work with the staffs of MTA and the GCCOG and others to ensure those current and key community leaders and other stakeholders are in the database.

(b) b. Communication Mechanisms Development

The consultant will develop multiple mechanisms for communicating with stakeholders regarding the AQAP. These could include, but not be limited to, E-mails, newsletters, MTA web site, GCCOG web site, periodic community presentations, and regular public briefings.

(c) c. Regular Meetings/Presentations

The consultant shall use the communications mechanisms developed in the preceding sub-task to maintain regular contact with key stakeholders to brief them on the process and provide any updates. This would include, but not be limited to, community and environmental leaders, elected officials, key agencies personnel, members of the Boards of Directors and others. Frequent meetings of at least two per month should be assumed, as a minimum.

(d) d. Public Meetings

The consultant, in cooperation with MTA and the GCCOG, arrange for public meetings in which community members may communicate their ideas and concerns for the AQAP.

Section 1.13 10. Final AQAP Report

Various reports have been prepared for the various tasks outlined herein. The Consultant will prepare a draft and final AQAP report that will include the final reports from all of the preceding tasks and recommendations for next steps for the continuation for the AQAP beyond this contract.

The consultant should assume a minimum of 100 copies of all draft and final reports and providing as many copies of CD's of these reports as necessary.

Section 1.14 11. Deliverables

As a minimum the consultant will provide 50 copies of each draft and final report and a CD for each of these reports. In addition, at least 25 copies of any other collateral material will be prepared and presented for meetings and for other occasions. This would include power point presentations made at any meetings.

Section 1.15 12. Schedule

The AQAP will be completed within two-years from the date of authorization to proceed. As previously indicated, the consultant will submit a detailed schedule within 20 days of being provided the notice to proceed.

IX. REPORTS

Item D

**Alternative 6B (widen 10 general
purpose lanes + 4 freight movement
lanes (zero emission trucks)) – Revised
TAC Recommendation**

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee
FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director of Gateway Cities COG
BY: TAC Chairman and Gateway Cities COG Staff
SUBJECT: Alternative 6B Revised TAC Recommendation

Background

At the previous PC meeting, the PC voted to concur with the TAC recommendations for the alternatives to be analyzed in the environmental documents for the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS.

The Original Recommendation by the TAC and PC was as follows:

Alternative 6B (widen to 10 general purpose lanes + 4 Freight Movement lanes (zero emission trucks)): Recommended due to the high level of benefits and consistency with the original community-based LPS and Purpose and Need. The number of general purpose lanes will be evaluated and modified, if necessary, for each segment of I-710 based upon refined traffic forecasting.

Alternative 6B also includes the projects identified for Alternative 1 and the improvements determined for Alternative 2, 3 (maximum goods movement component by rail), Alternative 4 and Alternative 5A as follows:

- ❖ Alternative 1 projects
- ❖ Alternative 2 improvements for TSM/TDM/Transit/ITS
- ❖ Alternative 3 – Maximum Goods Movement by Rail component
- ❖ Alternative 4 – Arterial Highways and freeways congestion relief projects
- ❖ Alternative 5A – Freeway improvements with 10 general purpose lanes

This alternative will assume design and usage of the freight movement corridor by zero emission trucks. This technology would include, but not be limited to, battery powered trucks as well as trucks powered by overhead electrical lines, linear induction motor or linear synchronous motor systems (or other concepts), or future zero emission technologies to be developed as part of the Freight Movement corridor. **The design of the freight corridor would also assume possible future conversion (or addition) to add a fixed guideway family of alternative technologies (e.g., maglev) as an option.**

After concurrence by the PC of this TAC recommendation, staff of AQMD requested an amendment to the language of the Recommendation for Alternative 6B. They requested a reconsideration by the TAC, who agreed, that resulted in the following language substituted for the last sentence (highlighted in red above) in the final paragraph for Alternative 6B: **“The design of the freight corridor will also assume**

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

possible future conversion, or initial construction, as feasible, (which may required additional environmental analysis and approval) of a fixed guideway family of alternative technologies, e.g., Maglev.”

After discussion, the TAC unanimously approved this change and is recommending it to the I-710 PC for concurrence. For reference the entire list of alternatives is attached.

Recommended Action: Concur with TAC Recommendation and/or Give Direction to Staff.

Attachment

I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

**Recommended Screened Alternatives
for study in the
Draft Project Report/Environmental Document
(Concurred with I-710 PC at the April 29, 2009 meeting)**

Alternative 1 (No Build): Required to be evaluated under CEQA and NEPA.

Alternative 5A (Widen to 10ⁱ general purpose lanes without the freight corridor): Recommended as a less impacting alternative than Alternative 6, but one which still provides measurable benefits. The number of general purpose lanes will be evaluated and modified, if necessary, for each segment of I-710 based upon refined traffic forecasting. Study of this alternative at the same level of detail as Alternative 6 will also allow for a meaningful comparison of the benefits, costs and impacts of the freight movement corridor in Alternatives 6A and 6B. Alternative 5A (without the freight corridor) **also includes** the projects identified for **Alternative 1** and the improvements determined for **Alternatives 2, 3 (maximum goods movement component by rail) and Alternative 4** as follows:

- Alternative 1 projects
- Alternative 2 improvements for TSM/TDM/Transit/ITS
- Alternative 3 – Maximum Goods Movement by Rail component
- Alternative 4 – Arterial Highways and freeway congestion relief projects

Alternative 6A (Widen to 10ⁱ general purpose lanes + 4 Freight Movement lanes [conventional trucks*]): Recommended due to the high level of benefits and consistency with the original community-based LPS and Purpose and Need. The number of general purpose lanes will be evaluated and modified, if necessary, for each segment of I-710 based upon refined traffic forecasting.

* - Conventional Trucks – Assumes newer (post -2007) projected diesel-/fossil-fueled trucks (new or with retrofitted engines required per new regulations and standards and normal fleet turnover with a mix of CNG and LNG trucks assumed as well)

Alternative 6A **also includes** the projects identified for **Alternative 1** and the improvements determined for **Alternatives 2, 3 (maximum goods movement component by rail), Alternative 4 and Alternative 5A** as follows:

- Alternative 1 projects
- Alternative 2 improvements for TSM/TDM/Transit/ITS
- Alternative 3 – Maximum Goods Movement by Rail component

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

- Alternative 4 – Arterial Highways and freeway congestion relief projects
- Alternative 5A – Freeway improvements with 10ⁱ general purpose lanes

This alternative will assume design and usage of the freight movement corridor by conventional trucks.

Alternative 6B (Widen to 10ⁱ general purpose lanes + 4 Freight Movement lanes [zero emissions trucks]): Recommended due to the high level of benefits and consistency with the original community-based LPS and Purpose and Need. The number of general purpose lanes will be evaluated and modified, if necessary, for each segment of I-710 based upon refined traffic forecasting.

Alternative 6B **also includes** the projects identified for **Alternative 1** and the improvements determined for **Alternatives 2, 3 (maximum goods movement component by rail), Alternative 4 and Alternative 5A** as follows:

- Alternative 1 projects
- Alternative 2 improvements for TSM/TDM/Transit/ITS
- Alternative 3 – Maximum Goods Movement by Rail component
- Alternative 4 – Arterial Highways and freeway congestion relief projects
- Alternative 5A – Freeway improvements with 10ⁱ general purpose lanes

This alternative will assume design and usage of the freight movement corridor by zero emission trucks. This technology would include, but not be limited to, battery powered trucks as well as trucks powered by overhead electrical lines, linear induction motor or linear synchronous motor systems (or other concepts), or future zero emission technologies to be developed designed as part of the Freight Movement corridor. The design of the freight corridor would also assume possible future conversion (or addition) to add a fixed track guideway family of alternative technologies (e.g. – maglev) as an option.

ⁱ – See Attachment for number of general purpose lanes subsequent evaluations

Alternatives Not Recommended (as “Stand –Alone Alternatives)

Alternatives 2 (TSM/TDM/Transit), 4 (Arterial Highway and I-710 Congestion Relief Improvements) and 5B (8 general purpose lanes + 2 HOV lanes) are not recommended to be carried into the engineering and environmental technical studies for the EIR/EIS as “stand alone” projects or alternatives. Alternatives 2 and 4 do not provide adequate improvements by themselves to address the purpose and need for the project as required by future traffic generated by population growth and the selected cargo forecast. However, the referenced studies indicated the value of the improvements identified for Alternatives 2 and 4 and, therefore, they are included as part of the recommended Alternatives 5A, 6A, and 6B. Alternative 5B is not recommended as it has similar impacts as 5A and lower benefits.

Alternative 3 (Goods Movement Enhancement by Rail and/or Advanced Technology) is not recommended to be carried forward as a “stand alone” alternative for the EIR/EIS.

Advanced Technology choices and development are still unclear, and a presumption about any particular advanced technology design concept and scope is premature to be evaluated at a detailed project level in the EIR/EIS. However, the I-710 Funding Partners wish to continue to encourage the goods movement industry to explore different options for Advanced Technology for Zero Emissions Container Movements Systems (ZECMS) that can serve the minimum required future container volumes to be moved in the Freight Movement lanes using fixed track guideway family of alternative technology systems as a future option with zero emission trucks (or zero emission transportation methods to move trucks) assumed at this time. New ZECMS concepts or methods that are adequately developed or demonstrated by other agencies or others in the future may be considered for subsequent analysis as part of a supplemental environmental report (including other alignments) to be prepared in the future for application and effects for the I-710 Corridor Project.

Maximum goods movement (or enhancements) by rail projects are assumed in the no-build alternative and included in all subsequent alternatives.

Therefore, the maximum goods movement by rail component of Alternative 3 is recommended to be included in Alternatives 5A, 6A and 6B but not as a “stand alone” alternative and the use of zero emission technologies (zero emission trucks with an option for adding a fixed track guideway alternative technology system at a later date) is recommended to be included in Alternative 6B.

IX. REPORTS

Item E

Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) Recommendations

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC)

SUBJECT: Corridor Advisory Committee Recommendations

Background

The CAC has met four times (monthly, with a recess in July) since the last PC meeting. The CAC presents the attached recommendations to the Project Committee (Attachment A).

The recommendations that the CAC acted upon at their October 15, 2009 meeting had been formulated by the Environmental Subject Working Group (ESWG), and related to three topic areas:

- Significance Thresholds
- Near-Source Modeling
- Construction Impacts

A summary of CAC and ESWG discussion and actions related to these three topic areas is included in Attachment B.

Recommended Action

Concur that the recommendations from the CAC be used for further analysis in the environmental phase and/or Give Direction to Staff.

Attachment A

**CAC RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE
 PROJECT COMMITTEE**

<i>Date of CAC Action</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
June 18, 2009	Adopt SCAQMD's air quality significance thresholds for the evaluation of alternatives in the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS.
June 18, 2009	Hear other expert opinions (such as AQMD's) that appear to counter Caltrans' current legal advice regarding significance thresholds.
June 18, 2009	Consider locating air quality monitoring stations along the corridor, especially near schools.
June 18, 2009	Implement the tools and methodologies presented for the Health Impact Assessment (HIA), specifically the "pathways to health outcomes," and fund this effort.
<i>The recommendations below were formulated by the Environmental Subject Working Group (ESWG) under three topic headings, and adopted by the CAC as official recommendations to the Project Committee.</i>	
<i>Related to Significance Thresholds</i>	
October 15, 2009	Adopt SCAQMD's air quality significance thresholds for the evaluation of alternatives in the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS, or an alternative threshold based on CEQA Guidelines.
October 15, 2009	Adopt significance thresholds before completion of draft AQ/HRA results.
October 15, 2009	As to significance thresholds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite AQMD to present their position to the Project Committee.¹ • Request a Caltrans joint headquarters/district presentation to the CAC on Caltrans' methodology and rationale (from a legal and scientific perspective—including representative(s) from UC Davis). • Have an open invitation for other stakeholders (e.g. NRDC) to come before the CAC with other opinions.

¹ The ESWG had recommended that AQMD present to the CAC. The CAC heard a presentation on October 15 and changed this recommendation to suggest that the Project Committee do the same.

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

<i>Related to Near-Source Modeling</i>	
October 15, 2009	Near-roadway modeling at a level smaller than the analysis unit of a Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) should be done as part of the air quality impact analysis. ²
October 15, 2009	For near-roadway analysis, consider ambient air quality data that reflect near-roadway concentrations.
October 15, 2009	Continue to monitor current research on modeling ultrafines, and incorporate as appropriate.
<i>Related to Construction Impacts</i>	
October 15, 2009	Develop a staging plan with adequate time to quantify construction impacts in the Health Risk Assessment.
October 15, 2009	Address full construction impacts from a health perspective.

² The CAC added the detail related to geographic analysis units to the ESWG's original recommendation.

Attachment B

ESWG FOCUS ISSUES:
BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF
DISCUSSION

I. SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

Context

Caltrans statewide policy dictates that significance thresholds are determined on a case-by-case basis. For the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS, the AERMOD model will be used to calculate the incremental air quality and health risk change between each of the 2035 Project Alternatives (including the 2035 No Build Alternative) and the CEQA Baseline (2008). Per Caltrans policy, the number of benefited receptors will be compared to the number of adversely affected receptors to provide an overall determination of project impacts. Caltrans will review SCAQMD significance thresholds and others when determining the overall impact of each project alternative.

On June 18, 2009, the CAC made the following recommendations related to significance thresholds:

Adopt SCAQMD's air quality significance thresholds for the evaluation of alternatives in the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS.

Hear expert legal opinions from others (for example, AQMD) that are counter to Caltrans' legal stance on determining significance thresholds.

Summary of ESGW discussion leading up to recommendations

ESWG members have advocated for the adoption of SCAQMD significance thresholds for the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS for the following reasons:

The credibility of study conclusions is dependent on the pre-determination of significance thresholds.

The entire I-710 study area lies within the South Coast Air Basin, so SCAQMD standards are relevant to the project.

ESWG Recommendations – Significance Thresholds:

Adopt SCAQMD's air quality significance thresholds for the evaluation of alternatives in the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS or establish an alternative threshold based on CEQA Guidelines.

Adopt significance thresholds before completion of draft AQ/HRA results.

As to significance thresholds:

- Invite AQMD to present their position to the CAC.
 - Request a Caltrans joint headquarters/district presentation to the CAC on Caltrans' methodology and rationale (from a legal and scientific perspective—including representative(s) from UC Davis).
 - Have an open invitation for other stakeholders (e.g. NRDC) to come before the CAC with other opinions.
-

II. NEAR-SOURCE MODELING

Context

Beyond the usual freeway project CEQA/NEPA analyses, AERMOD dispersion modeling is being used in the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment (AQ/HRA) to analyze location-specific impacts to air quality. The air quality modeling team has stated that input information and agency-approved modeling tools for quantitative, project-level comparative analysis are not available to model near-source impacts (closer than 25 to 100m from the freeway) in the way described by ESWG members.

On June 18, 2009, the CAC requested that the ESWG discuss the topic of modeling near-source impacts to help them formulate a recommendation for the Project Committee. Near-source impacts have not been discussed extensively by the CAC.

Summary of ESWG discussion leading up to recommendations

The ESWG believes that health impacts at near-roadway receptors are of enough concern that near-roadway modeling should be done. Specific suggestions and ideas by members have included:

Analyze units smaller than a TAZ to isolate areas that are very close to the freeway.

Consider receptors that will assume "near-freeway" status after expansion.

Include NO₂ in the air quality analysis, since ESWG members believe that NO₂ impacts generally parallel impacts of ultrafines.

ESWG Recommendations – Near Source Modeling:

Near-roadway modeling should be done as part of the air quality impact analysis.

For near-roadway analysis, consider ambient air quality data that reflect near-roadway concentrations.

Continue to monitor current research on modeling ultrafines, and incorporate as appropriate.

III. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

Context

The Project Team has stated that construction phasing cannot be determined until a project alternative is selected and funding identified. Without specific information as to location and construction activity scheduling, the level of detail necessary for a full AQ/HRA assessment of construction activities is not available. A construction emission estimate and project-specific mitigation measures for construction-related air quality impacts will be included in the EIR/EIS per Caltrans' Standard Environmental Reference (SER).

On June 18, 2009, the CAC requested that the ESWG discuss the topic of construction impacts to help them formulate a recommendation for the Project Committee. The CAC did not reach a consensus on the issue of construction impacts.

Summary of ESWG discussion leading up to recommendations

Because of the anticipated duration of construction, which spans up to two K-12 cycles of school children, the ESWG has expressed the utmost importance of analyzing construction impacts in the I-710 EIR/EIS.

In order to determine the extent of potential mitigation and the implementation of mitigation measures, the ESWG believes air quality and health risk impacts should be quantified using a reasonable worst-case scenario and full dispersion modeling.

The community needs to feel confident that construction impacts will properly be analyzed and disclosed, including a Health Risk Assessment, in the selection of an alternative when adequate information becomes available.

ESWG Recommendations – Construction Impacts:

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

Develop a staging plan with adequate time to quantify construction impacts in the Health Risk Assessment.

Address full construction impacts from a health perspective.

IX. REPORTS
Item F

**ITS Implementation Plan for Goods
Movement**

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
October 29, 2009

TO: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Project Committee
FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director of Gateway Cities COG
BY: Gateway Cities COG Staff
SUBJECT: ITS Implementation Plan for Goods Movement

Background

Gateway Cities COG has been proceeding with preparing studies and analyses to implement Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) projects for Goods Movement for the GCCOG area. ITS is one of the elements included with the alternatives being considered for the I-710 Corridor Project. Gateway Cities COG staff will make a brief presentation on the status of an ITS Implementation Plan for Goods Movement that is being developed.

Recommended Action

Receive and File Report