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• AQAP Update and 2012 Look Forward
• AQAP Participation Framework
• I-710 HIA Peer Review Update
Air Quality Action Plan
Update and 2012 Look Forward
Overview of AQAP and 2012 Schedule

We will review:

• Relationship between AQAP and EIR/EIS tasks
• Development Process for AQAP
• 2012 Look Forward
• AQAP Task Update
Two Distinct Project Study Areas

I-710 Corridor

- I-710 EIR/EIS Numerical Technical Studies (Noise, AQ/HRA) COMPLETED 2011
- LA HIA COMPLETED 2011
- I-710 Near Roadway Modeling (Ultrafines) COMPLETED 2011
- I-710 Construction Staging and Phasing COMPLETED 2011

GCCCOG Subregion AQAP

- Compendium Update
- Emissions Inventory
- AQ/HRA
- New AQ Measures
- Toolkit
- Community Medical Needs Assessment COMPLETED 2011
AQAP Toolkit Development Process

Compendium Update  Early Actions  AQAP Toolkit Development

AQ/HRA Protocol  Emission Inventory  AQ/HRA  AQ Strategies

Sources
Traffic (includes I-710)
Industry
Rail
Ports
Powerplants etc.

Notes:
CSP - I-710 Construction Staging and Phasing
Ultra - Ultrafines Research
CMNA - Community Medical Needs Assessment
HIA - Health Impact Assessment
AQAP 2012 Outlook

Jan-March
Technical Webinar – Early Action Plan

Apr-May
Technical Webinar – Emission Inventory

June-July
Technical Webinar – Air Quality

Aug-Oct
Technical Webinar – Health Risk Assessment
Draft AQAP presented to EC, TC

Nov 2012 – Jan 2013
Technical Webinar – AQAP Toolkit
Final AQAP presented to EC, TC
## AQAP Task Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Tasks</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Medical Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Near Roadway Modeling</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Ultrafines</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Protocol</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendium Update</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Air Quality Analysis</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Construction Staging and Phasing Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Health Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Work Product Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Risk Assessment</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Air Quality Strategies</td>
<td>Task starts in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of New Air Quality Measures</td>
<td>Task starts in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQAP Early Action Support</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop AQAP Report</td>
<td>Task start in April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantitative Air Quality Analysis

- Baseline emissions developed from AQMD data
- Updated with 3rd party measures for years 2009, 2023, 2035
- Developed meteorological inputs for AQ modeling

Review 2006 Emission Data
Update with 3rd Party Measures
Develop inputs into AQ modeling (Nov)
Produce emission, air quality dispersion analyses (Mar)
Evaluate hot spots, significance thresholds (Mar)
Create Air Quality Impact Report (Sep)
Health Risk Assessment

- Methodology developed through HRA working group.
- Inventory and dispersion modeling underway.

Develop AQ forecasts 2009, 2023, 2035

Develop inputs into HRA modeling (Dec)

Compare health impacts in 2008, 2023, 2035. (June)

Evaluate effectiveness of new measures (Dec 2012)

Include in Air Quality Analysis Report (Jan 2013)
Early Action Plan

- Completed evaluation of status of Early Action Items
- Initiated Research on remaining Early Action Implementation.
- Conducted Workshop with Planning Directors and Public Works
- Initial Findings in Feb

AQAP Task Update

- Review Early Action Items
- Conduct Evaluation
- Consult with Environmental Groups
- Consult with Local Govt’s
- Determine Support Rqmt’s
- Develop Early Action Plan (Nov/Dec)
- Framework Discussion (Feb)
AQAP 2012 Participation Framework

• Ongoing coordination of/with Gateway Cities:
  o Environmental Committee
  o Transportation Committee
  o GCCOG Board

• Ongoing coordination with stakeholders
  o Public Participation Meetings
  o Technical Webinars
2012 Schedule of Public Participation Meetings

• **August 15**: Environmental Committee Meeting
  - Presentation of Draft Air Quality Action Plan
• **October 3**: Transportation Committee and GCCOG Board
  - Presentation of Draft Air Quality Action Plan
• **November 21**: Environmental Committee Meeting
  - Presentation of Final Air Quality Action Plan
• **January 2**: Transportation Committee Meeting
  - Presentation of Final Air Quality Action Plan
2012 Schedule of Technical Webinars

- Purpose: provide regular updates and information on AQAP technical work
- Suggested topics and schedule:
  - February: Early Action Plan
  - April: Gateway Cities Emission Inventory
  - June: Gateway Cities Air Quality
  - August: Health Risk Assessment
  - October: AQAP Toolkit
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AQAP Participation Framework

Oct – Nov 2011

- I-710 HIA Work Product
- Review Draft Findings & Recommendations

I-710 Project Team

October 5th

GCCOG Board

October 5th

November 2nd

Transportation Committee

October 26th

Environmental Committee

October 12/13 Roundtable Meetings

October 24th SPECIAL ROUNDTABLE MEETING

November 9th and 14th SPECIAL ROUNDTABLE MEETINGS

AQAP Roundtables

October 5th

November 2nd

AQAP Technical Working Groups

I-710 HIA September 26th & October 3rd

I-710 HIA Work Product

Review Draft Findings & Recommendations

October 26th

October 5th

November 2nd

October 24th SPECIAL ROUNDTABLE MEETING

November 9th and 14th SPECIAL ROUNDTABLE MEETINGS

I-710 HIA September 26th & October 3rd
HIA Comment Letters

1. Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach

2. Union Pacific and BNSF Railway

3. Coalition for Clean Air
   Communities for a Better Environment
   East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
   Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma
   Natural Resources Defense Council, and
   Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles
Supportive Comments:
Some support for the HIA and other tools that can improve understanding of health impacts in the region.

Suggested Improvements
• Some suggestions for additional data that might be considered
• Suggestions for improving the assessment.
Comments Received During HIA Review

Concerns:

• About the scientific basis and the presentation of some of the findings.

• That the recommendations, although worthwhile, appear to be outside the scope or might not be practical or feasible.

• That the assessment does not allow a decision-maker to distinguish between the alternatives.
Universal Comment

• The HIA should be subjected to an independent peer review, particularly given the possibility that this assessment could serve as a model for other large infrastructure projects.
• The National Research Council (NRC) recently released report provides a framework and guidance for conducting HIA in the United States.

• One of the challenges noted in the report was the need to ensure the quality and credibility of HIA.

• Peer review was suggested as one approach to increasing the legitimacy of conclusions and their acceptance and utility in the decision-making process.
Transportation Committee Action – November 2011

A. Recommended an independent Peer Review process (as outlined in the COG staff report) of the work product, Health Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by Human Impact Partners, and

B. The Peer Review shall include inputs and comments from the Technical Working Group and the Roundtables and Committees, and

C. At the conclusion of the Peer Review, a final draft HIA report and the peer review reports shall be submitted to Caltrans.
Welcome to the Gateway Cities AQAP

Environmental Committee

January 25, 2012
Agenda

- AQAP Update and 2012 Look Forward
- AQAP Participation Framework
- I-710 HIA Peer Review Update
I-710 Health Impact Analysis (HIA) Peer Review Process
1. Review National Academy of Sciences (NAS) Peer Review Process and Preliminary Schedule
2. Review and Receive input on Preliminary Guiding Questions
3. Review Committee Expertise Required and identify potential Review Panel Members
Independent Peer Review – Next Steps

- Gateway Cities Council of Governments request the National Research Council (NRC) to conduct an independent peer review of the I-710 HIA work product in December 2011;

- Prospectus was approved by the NAS Governing Board at its January 2012 Meeting;

- A Committee of the NRC will be convened to conduct an independent review of the draft health impact assessment (HIA) for the I-710 corridor project. The committee will prepare a brief report that addresses questions outlined in the Prospectus;

- Purpose of January 25th EC Meeting is to review proposed research questions submitted to the NAS, and to receive suggestions for peer reviewers from EC and AQAP Roundtable Members.
National Academies of Science

- Established in 1863 to address the government’s urgent need for an independent advisor on scientific matters.

- Expanded to include the National Research Council in 1916, the National Academy of Engineering in 1964, and the Institute of Medicine in 1970.
National Academies of Science

• The National Academy of Sciences (NAS), National Academy of Engineering (NAE), and the Institute of Medicine (IOM)
  o private, nonprofit membership organizations
  o elect the nation’s leading scientists, engineers, and medical professionals, and
  o engage in a wide variety of activities to advance research and knowledge in science, engineering, and medicine.

• Most policy studies requested by the U.S. government are conducted by the NRC, operated jointly by NAS and the NAE.
NAS Peer Review Process

**STAGE 1**
- Project starts when funding is received

**STAGE 2**
- Provisional slate approved by NAS President
- Provisional committee posted for public comment via Current Project System
- Committee balance and expertise evaluated; any conflict of interest are investigated

**STAGE 3**
- Final committee formally approved
- Committee's first meeting

---

DEFINING THE STUDY
- NRC Governing Board Reviews and approves study scope and plan

COMMITTEE SELECTION

COMMITTEE
• The committee will hold 2 meetings.
  o One public meeting will be held in California to gather information from the sponsor, researchers, the public, and other interested parties.
  o A pre-publication version of the report will be provided in 6 months, and the final version published by the National Academies Press in 8 months.
  o Some information to be reviewed by the committee may be required to remain confidential until the report is released.
Peer Review – Preliminary Work Plan

- January 16, 2012: Solicit recommendations for committee
- Late January 2012: Submit provisional committee slate for approval
- Early February 2012: Receive approval for provisional committee slate and request calendars from provisional committee members
- Late March 2012: Hold first committee meeting in California; meeting would include public session to hear from sponsors and other stakeholders.
- Early May 2012: Hold second committee meeting in Washington, DC
- Early June 2012: Submit report to review
- Mid-June 2012: Receive review comments
- Early July 2012: Send final report to the committee for sign-off
- Mid-July 2012: Receive sign-off by Report Review Committee
- Late July 2012: Release pre-publication of committee report and hold report briefing in California
- Late August 2012: Final report published by National Academies Press

A 6.5 month Peer Review schedule was estimated by NAS staff.
Peer Review Process – Guiding Questions

1. Does the HIA use appropriate and scientifically defensible data and methods?

2. On the basis of the committee’s expertise, do there appear to be data or information missing from the assessment?

3. Were the causal associations in the HIA between stressors and effects supported by the data?

4. Are the conclusions of the HIA supported by the data?

5. Are the HIA recommendations potentially effective and consistent with the project’s projected health impacts?
6. Were the data, methods, and conclusions presented appropriately in a clear, logical, accurate, and unbiased manner?

7. Was the HIA balanced in its analyses (that is, did it weigh both positive and negative studies)?

8. Has the draft HIA appropriately acknowledged and characterized uncertainties in the data, assumptions, and model results, and has it appropriately reflected such uncertainties in its findings and recommendations?

9. Are the conclusions and recommendations potentially useful for health-based decision-making?
Expertise required:

• exposure assessment;
• air-quality, noise, and traffic-safety modeling;
• toxicology; epidemiology; public health;
• health impact assessment;
• transportation planning/engineering;
• urban planning; social sciences
Thank You

Questions / Comments?