



The Gateway Cities
Air Quality Action Plan

AQAP Technical Roundtable – October 12, 2011

Meeting Summary

Location: Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Boulevard
Paramount, CA 90723

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Invited Participants (those in attendance highlighted)

Ruben Arceo, City of La Mirada

Steve Forster, City of La Mirada

Jill Griffiths, City of Long Beach

Wendell Johnson, City of Compton

Dorian Alcantar, City of Compton (Alternate)

Nelson Kerr, City of Long Beach (Alternate)

Steve Lefever, City of South Gate

David McDonald, Los Angeles County Regional Planning

Daniel Ojeda, City of Lynwood

Kevin Maggay, Port of Los Angeles

Lewis Pozzebon, City of Vernon

Evenor Masis, Los Angeles County Public Health

Robert Vasquez, Los Angeles County Public Health

Jon Leonard, TIAX

Susan Nakamura, South Coast Air Quality Management District

Jonathan Nadler, Southern California Association of Governments (Webinar)

LaDonna DiCamillo, Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway

Alternates

Susan Sturges, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Webinar)

Others Present:

Norm Kirshenbaum, Tri-cities Regional Occupation Program (webinar)

The Gateway Cities
Air Quality Action Plan

Project Team

GCCOG:	Jerry Wood, Karen Heit
Metro:	Adrian Alvarez, Danielle Valentino (webinar)
ICF Team:	Andrew Papson, Arlene Rosenbaum (webinar),
Arellano Assoc:	Susan DeSantis, Maria Yanez-Forgash, Elizabeth Hansburg
HIP:	Jonathan Heller

The Gateway Cities
Air Quality Action Plan

Agenda**I. Opening Comments and Introductions**

Susan DeSantis, Arellano Associates

Ms. DeSantis welcomed the Roundtable Members and asked those present to introduce themselves, followed by those participating by webinar.

II. Agenda Overview

Susan DeSantis, Arellano Associates

Ms. DeSantis reviewed the agenda items for the day's meeting and gave a detailed overview of the upcoming calendar of meetings, including the Advisory Roundtable meeting on Thursday, October 13 and the joint Roundtable meeting scheduled for October 24. She relayed that the input received from these meetings will be presented to the Environmental Committee and then to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors for the Gateway Cities COG, on October 26 and November 2, respectively.

Ms. DeSantis next moved to a discussion of the preamble that was authored by Technical Working Group Member Chris Patton. After reading the preamble, Ms. DeSantis opened the floor for comments. The general feedback from the Technical Roundtable Members present was that the preamble is lengthy and should be broken up into sections, incorporated into the introduction of the HIA Report and also at the beginning of each chapter's recommendation section. Jonathan Heller concurred. Lastly, Ms. DeSantis reviewed some of the questions and responses that came out of the Technical Working Group meetings.

III. Oral Reports: Mobility and Air Quality Recommendations**A. Mobility Chapter**

Mr. Heller gave a brief overview of the Mobility Chapter of the HIA. He informed the TRT members that an unabridged version was available online via a link on ICF's webpage. Mr. Heller began by reviewing the Pathways to Health, which outlines the possible effects of the I-710 Project on mobility. He explained that travel time and accessibility are significant components in determining an individual's travel mode. He emphasized that increased speeds can be a deterrent to biking and can also have a harmful effect on pedestrians. He also noted that people who use public transportation tend to get more exercise than those who mainly use private vehicles because public transit riders walk to and from the transit station; this was also referred to as active transportation. Next, Mr. Heller explained the physical features that make an environment favorable or poor for pedestrians and bikers. Among the features that encourage active walking and biking are well-marked crosswalks such as those that use "piano key striping" and pedestrian countdown crosswalk signals. Negative features are sidewalks obstructed by poles or other barriers that impede a clear path. Mr. Heller reviewed the chronic disease rates for the study area and compared them to those for Los Angeles County. Mr. Heller noted that disease rates are tied to physical activity, but mobility makes up only one aspect of physical activity.

Mr. Heller moved on and reviewed the current Mode Share statistics and projections that will be included in the I-710 EIR/EIS; however, he noted, the future breakdown of transit modes may

The Gateway Cities Air Quality Action Plan

differ from these projections because there will be factors that will change depending on which building alternative is employed. HIP predicts that under all of the alternatives, walking and biking are projected to decrease; but the amount by which is difficult to project. Lastly, Mr. Heller reviewed HIP's predictions for public transit use under each of the alternatives. Alternatives 1 and 5A will increase the rates of public transit use because of increased congestion and, under 5A, investment in public transit infrastructure. Conversely, HIP predicts that under Alternatives 6A/B/C, it is expected to decrease because increased speeds will enable people to get from place to place more quickly despite investments in public transit. Adrian Alvarez noted that personal preferences indicate that people still prefer using vehicles over transit.

Lastly, Mr. Heller explained HIP's predictions for health outcomes in each of the alternatives. Under all of the alternatives, both rates of chronic disease, such as diabetes and heart disease, and mental illness, resulting from a decrease in social cohesion and opportunities for physical activity, are expected to stay the same or increase. Emergency response times are projected to improve for Alternative 6A/B/C, stay the same for Alternative 5A, and decrease for Alternative 1. Mr. Heller then invited questions or comments.

Several members asked questions about the impact of increased speed and exposure to fuel exhaust that bikers experience on arterial roads. Another member asked why the mobility chapter did not also include the increased access to goods and services that will come with expanding the capacity of the I-710. Mr. Heller responded that it is covered in a subsequent chapter. The group also asked questions about whether current conditions, as represented by 2008 measured conditions, or the "No Build" project alternative should serve as the baseline for measuring projected changes resulting from the I-710 expansion. Several group members thought it should be the No Build (Alternative 1), while Mr. Heller believed the baseline should be the existing conditions. They debated the question of whether growth in the region will be spurred by expansion of the I-710, or if it will happen regardless. The group also asked about the differences in the presentation of the health outcomes in the Pathways to Health diagram versus the table summarizing the health outcomes for each of the building alternatives.

B. Air Quality Chapter

Mr. Heller began his presentation on the Air Quality Chapter by reviewing the Pathways to Health diagram and explaining the research that expressly ties exposure to air pollution to negative health effects including respiratory diseases and cardiovascular diseases. He noted that Los Angeles has the worst quality air in the nation. One of the reasons is because LA is in a basin, and the topography doesn't help the air quality. He also relayed that the Advisory Roundtable requested information on neurological conditions that may be affected by air pollution, but, as the full HIA describes, the research is not strong enough to say that the two are causally linked. He then reviewed the existing health conditions in the study area, which are characteristic of the rest of Los Angeles County. He went on to say that CO and NO_x concentrations are predicted to decrease and be within state and federal standards; however, the data on PM2.5 is still being researched. He concluded by explaining that air quality conditions will improve by 2035 under

The Gateway Cities
Air Quality Action Plan

each of the possible build alternatives through the consequence of cleaner fuels and better technologies, which will likely improve the health of everyone living in the study area. Mr. Heller then proceeded to take questions.

One member questioned why additional air quality recommendations were necessary if under all Alternatives air quality was improving. Mr. Heller pointed out that air quality is the primary concern in the community. The improvements are only a consequence of changes in fuel formulas and vehicle technology; not because there have been any other mitigating efforts. Still, this member felt that the recommendations made here were not specific to the I-710. The group debated the purpose of the HIA and the issue of proportionality and degree of responsibility for addressing health concerns within the community.

IV. Roundtable Discussion on Recommendations

Ms. DeSantis moved to the Roundtable discussion, explaining that the purpose of the exercise was to review each recommendation, make any changes or refinements, define proportional responsibility of the agencies that may have a role to play, and finally to decide if there was support for the recommendation. The group discussed nine mobility recommendations. The changes to each included refining the language to make them more detailed and specific. Some recommendation statements were phrased with a general application, so Roundtable members identified those issues to which each recommendation would best apply. After these refinements and noting which agencies could play an implementation role, the members signaled their support for these constructive measures. Because of time constraints, discussion of the air quality recommendations was brief. The discussion reviewed the reasons for the projected improvement in air quality, which is improvement in fuel formulas and continued turnover of automobiles to newer models with reduced levels of emissions. Mr. Alvarez noted that Alternative 6B significantly improves air quality with respect to greenhouse gasses. They also discussed what else could be done outside of the I-710 project to improve air quality. Ms. DeSantis invited TRT members to attend the upcoming meetings and to submit any additional comments in writing before bringing the discussion to a close.

V. I-710 Construction Staging and Phasing Emissions Report Findings

Mr. Papson then presented the detailed summary of the I-710 Construction Staging and Phasing Emissions Report, the purpose of which is to estimate the emissions output during the conceptual construction and phasing plan for the I-710. The corridor has been divided into seven segments and construction emissions were calculated for three emission types: NO_x, PM10, and PM2.5. He emphasized that during the duration of the project, emissions will exceed the recommended government standards only a few times and then only briefly. The recommendations included ways to reduce NO_x emissions by using newer construction equipment when available. To reduce PM10 and PM2.5 emissions, frequent watering of the dirt using water or surfactants can prevent it from becoming airborne. Mr. Papson also reviewed how the model has been recently updated with new data that became available during the study time. Upon conclusion, one member asked whether or not the model used accounted for

The Gateway Cities
Air Quality Action Plan

off road mobile construction emissions such as generators. Mr. Papson confirmed that it did. Briefly stated, the report findings indicate that for the duration of the project:

- Construction emissions do not exceed PM10 or PM2.5 thresholds;
- Fugitive dust will exceed PM10 and PM2.5 thresholds; and
- NO_x will exceed thresholds at some segments, for a limited time

VI. Adjournment

At the conclusion of Mr. Papson's presentation, Ms. DeSantis made available newsletters that describe the efforts and updates of the AQAP Project. She then adjourned the meeting.