

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Environmental Committee

AGENDA

*Wednesday, October 26, 2011
6:00 - 8:30 p.m. Meeting*

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

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 16401 PARAMOUNT BOULEVARD, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The Environmental Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The Environmental Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the Environmental Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the Environmental Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at this time the Environmental Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the Environmental Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- 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 - Three minutes for each speaker.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the September 28, 2011 meeting of the Environmental Committee

VII. REPORTS

A. AQAP Status and Schedule Update - Oral Report by ICF

10 Min. SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

B. AQAP Participation Framework Committees Reports - Oral Report by Arellano Associates

- HIA Technical Working Group
- Technical Roundtable
- Advisory Roundtable

10 Min. SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

C. I-710 Construction Staging Emissions Final Report - Presentation by ICF

30 Min. SUGGESTED ACTION: CONCUR WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

D. I-710 HIA Final Draft Report - Presentation by HIP

75 Min. SUGGESTED ACTION: CONCUR WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

E. COG Engineer's Report - Oral Report by Jerry Wood

10 Min. SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE REVIEW

IX. COMMENTS FROM ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE CHAIR MEMBERS

X. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 8:30 p.m. unless the Environmental Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regularly scheduled Environmental Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM A
APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
Environmental Committee
Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 28, 2011

6:00 - 8:30 p.m. Meeting

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bill DeWitt called the meeting to order at 6:13 PM.

II. ROLL CALL – BY SELF INTRODUCTIONS

Roll call was taken by self-introduction.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Bill DeWitt – City of South Gate; Steve Lefever – Planning Directors Committee Representative (City of South Gate); Wendell Johnson – I-710 TAC, 91-605-405 TAC Representative (City of Compton); Elizabeth Warren – FuturePorts; Craig Wong – representing Ron Arias, City of Long Beach Health and Human Services Department; Judith Mitchell – South Coast Air Quality Management District Board; Adrian Martinez – Natural Resources Defense Council; Jorge Rifa – City Managers Committee Liaison (City of Commerce); TL Garret - Pacific Marine Shipping Association; Douglas Drummond – Port of Long Beach

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Angelo Logan – AQAP Advisory Roundtable Representative (East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice); Luis Cabrales – AQAP Advisory Roundtable Representative (Coalition for Clean Air); Ruben Arceo – I-5 JPA Representative (City of La Mirada); Daniel Ojeda – AQAP Technical Roundtable Representative (City of Lynwood); Angie Castro – representing Supervisor Gloria Molina; David Libatique - Port of Los Angeles; Karly Katona – representing Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas

OTHERS PRESENT: Jerry Wood – GCCOG Staff; Ed Carr - ICF International; Andrew Papson - ICF International; Adrian Alvarez – Metro; Danielle Valentino – Metro; Susan DeSantis – Arellano Associates; Maria Yanez-Forgash – Arellano Associates; Katie Burnside – Arellano Associates; Elizabeth Hansburg – Arellano Associates

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Member Steve Lefever led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no additions to the meeting minutes of the August 24, 2011 meeting of the Environmental Committee. Chairman DeWitt made a motion to receive and file the report. Member Wendell Johnson seconded the motion to no objection.

VII. REPORTS

A. AQAP Project Update – Oral Report by ICF

Overall Status, Schedule and 101 Handout Review

Andrew Papson presented a Project Update on the AQAP. He reviewed the objectives and components of the AQAP and identified those that are part of the I-710 EIR/EIS and those that are part of the GCCOG AQAP process. He presented an assessment of the work completed on each task to date and the scheduled completion dates for the tasks still in process. He paused to allow for questions, but there were no questions from the Committee.

B. I-710 Deliverables – Oral Reports

Mr. Papson then moved to a more detailed description of each task.

HIA Status/Overview

Mr. Papson reported that a draft version of the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) report is under review and the final report will be presented to the Roundtables, Environmental Committee, Transportation Committee and GCCOG Board of Directors at their respective meetings in October and November.

AQAP Early Action Projects Status/Overview

The Early Action Items for Local Governments were completed and a workshop was conducted for Planning Directors and Public Works Officials in early September.

Construction Staging Status/Overview

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 construction of the I-710 improvements over the next 17 years. The construction period has been divided into seven time segments and emissions rates were calculated for three emission types: NOx, PM10 and PM2.5. The preliminary findings show when emissions will exceed the state and federal recommended threshold amount and by how much.

Several clarifying questions were asked.

Member Adrian Martinez asked how the emissions model was updated; what were the previous assumptions and how they changed. Ed Carr explained that the original model assumed a more aggressive turn over of construction vehicles; however, because of the recession, Caltrans is not replacing their construction fleet as quickly. This fact was adjusted in the model.

Member Judith Mitchell asked if the graph on slide 20 took into account the control measures that would be used to control fugitive dust. Mr. Carr responded that it did. Member Mitchell said that she would have hoped for better results given that these emissions estimates already took into consideration mitigation measures. Member T.L. Garrett added that he shared Member Mitchell's concerns.

Participation Framework Status and Reviews

Next, Susan DeSantis gave an overview of the Participation Framework and updated the Committee on the current status. She reviewed the meetings that have taken place and those that are planned in the coming month. She relayed a sampling of the comments and questions as well as the project team's responses that have come out of the Technical and Advisory Roundtable meetings concerning the Noise Chapter of the HIA, the New Roadway Emissions Modeling, and the Ultrafine Particle research.

Member Mitchell asked about the fugitive dust associated with concrete, which was a sample comment in Ms. DeSantis' presentation. Jerry Wood responded that dust is associated with concrete during the demolition phase of construction and that contractors will often reuse it, thus keeping it from piling up at work sites.

At the end of Ms. DeSantis' presentation, Chairman DeWitt motioned that it be received and filed. Member Douglas Drummond seconded the motion, which passed without objection.

C. AQAP Final Reports Announcement– Oral Report by ICF

Sensitive Receptor Sites Report

Mr. Papson reported that the Sensitive Receptor Site Report was completed. Mr. Wood added that it was a detailed inventory of all the sensitive receptors in the Gateway Cities. He said the report is available at this time.

No action was taken on this report.

D. AQAP – I-710 Final Reports – Presentations of Findings by ICF

Mr. Wood reviewed the background of the AQAP I-710-related reports: Heath Impact Analysis (HIA), Near Roadway Modeling, and Ultrafine Particle Research. He noted that the I-710 Project Committee (PC) had requested an additional report on the medical resources available in the Gateway Cities in the form of a Community Medical Needs Assessment.

Mr. Wood introduced Ed Carr who reported on the Near Roadway Modeling and presented a summary of the research on Ultrafine Particles.

I-710 Near-Roadway Modeling Study

Mr. Carr explained the AERMOD methodology used to compare the monitored data to the modeled data for CO and NOx emissions. This is the same model that is being used by Caltrans

in the I-710 EIR/EIS. He indicated that there was a lot of uncertainty when trying to predict traffic volumes and precise mix of diesel v. gasoline vehicles on the road at any given time. He said that in general there was a lot of scatter in studies like these; however, this comparison was also hampered by a lack of meteorological data and modifications to the model necessary to make the comparison. In addition, the AERMOD model is designed to measure stationary sources of air pollutants. He added that the correlation between the two data sets improved when the modeled data was compared with monitored weigh-in-motion data because it contains hour-by-hour observations of diesel trucks and light duty gasoline vehicles. The previous observed data set used average weekday vehicle activity for morning, midday, evening and "all other" time periods.

Member T.L. Garrett asked Mr. Carr if he had gone back to Caltrans and asked how they intended to deal with problems concerning the AERMOD model. Mr. Carr indicated that he had not approached Caltrans about this question. Mr. Wood added that Caltrans is not relying on the model as a predictor of emissions output but rather is using it to compare project alternatives. He indicated that the PC was informed of this uncertainty, but that they expressed a desire to proceed with the model anyway.

Member Garrett expressed again that the model is useless without reliable data to input. Mr. Wood responded that one of the recommendations that would likely come from this report is to install on-site monitoring and use the data to build a model specific to the I-710. He noted that Measure R funds could be used to install air monitoring stations along the 710. Member Garrett emphasized the importance of also collecting traffic and volume data as well as having a reliable model. Mr. Carr added that the EPA is currently working on a new model designed for mobile sources.

I-710 Ultrafine Research Study

Next Mr. Carr reviewed his research on ultrafine particles. He explained that a major source of ultrafine particles is vehicle tailpipe emissions. Ultrafines are present at some level though out an urban environment, and are usually higher near roadways. In addition, ultrafine particles successfully permeate buildings such as houses, so the count of UFPs indoors and outdoors will be similar when taken at location in close proximity. He explained that current regulations restrict the mass of vehicle emissions, but ultrafines are so small that even for a large number of particles their mass is insignificant. At present, the EPA has no plans to regulate ultrafine particles. The most effective reduction of ultrafine particles from heavy-duty diesel vehicles are diesel particulate filters (DPFs). The SCAQMD will develop an assessment of ultrafine particles in the L.A. region through their MATES-IV study.

After Mr. Carr concluded his report, Chairman DeWitt asked when the concern about ultrafines began. Mr. Carr said awareness was mainstreamed by reports made at an SCAQMD Conference in 2006. Mr. DeWitt asked if ultrafine particles were able to permeate the barriers in clean rooms. Mr. Carr said he would need to research and report back.

Community Medical Needs Assessment

Mr. Wood gave a brief presentation on the Community Medical Needs Assessment for the Gateway Cities. The research revealed that the west side of the Gateway Cities region suffers a higher percentage of overcrowded housing and has more medically underserved neighborhoods than the central or eastern portion of the region. Overall, the health issues and

disease rates in the Gateway Cities are consistent with those reported for L.A. County as a whole.

Member Elizabeth Warren asked if the CMNA report contained statistics comparing the Gateway Cities with the national trends. Mr. Wood said no, that the Gateway Cities were only compared with the rest of L.A. County, but the opportunity exists to gather such information and compare the Gateway Cities with state and national data in an updated version of the CMNA report.

The COG staff recommended that the above reports be received and filed so that the reports could be forwarded on to the Transportation Committee, the GCCOG Board and the I-710 Project Team for possible consideration in the I-710 EIR/EIS.

Mr. DeWitt so motioned and Member Garrett seconded the motion, which passed without objection.

E. COG Engineer's Report by Jerry Wood – Oral Report

Mr. Wood clarified questions regarding emissions during the I-710 construction period. He stated that the design of the interchange would not greatly impact the equipment emissions predictions because the same equipment is needed to excavate and build the interchange. The biggest source of emissions during construction is fugitive dust and that would not change significantly. This was summarized in a memo and provided it to the Committee Members and everyone present at the meeting.

Next Mr. Wood addressed a prior request from Environmental Committee members for more information regarding the health care costs associated with pollution. He summarized an EPA report on this question in a memo and provided it to the Committee Members and everyone present at the meeting. According to the memo, the dollar figure is a measure of the population's "willingness to pay" to avoid increased health risks leading to premature death. Mr. Wood referred to tables attached to the memo to an estimate of the costs for individuals.

Chairman DeWitt motioned to receive and file the report, which he noted would become part of the meeting minutes. Member Martinez seconded the motion, which passed without objection.

MEETING SCHEDULE REVIEW

The next meeting of the Environmental Committee is October 26, 2011.

VIII. COMMENTS FROM ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE CHAIR OR MEMBERS

There were no additional comments from Committee members.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM.

VII. STAFF REPORTS ITEM C

I-710 CONSTRUCTION STAGING EMISSIONS FINAL REPORT

TO: Environmental Committee

FROM: Richard, Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Jerry R. Wood, Director of Transportation and Engineering, Gateway Cities COG

SUBJECT: I-710 Construction Staging Emissions Analysis Final Report

Background

At the October 29, 2009 meeting of the I-710 Project Committee (PC), the PC voted to unanimously “link” the Gateway Cities Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) with the I-710 EIR/EIS by including a Construction Phasing Impacts Emission Analysis on Air Quality for the I-710 Corridor Project. However, the PC decided at this meeting to defer action on the construction impacts to its subsequent meeting on January 28, 2010. At its January 28, 2010 meeting the PC voted to concur with the Corridor Advisory Committee’s (CAC’s) recommendations that included the construction staging and phasing emissions analysis. Therefore, per the direction of the PC, a construction staging plan and an emission analysis of that plan was prepared.

Issue

The Gateway Cities staff prepared a construction staging and phasing plan for the entire project. That plan was presented to the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee in May, 2011. The Plan was approved and formed the basis for the emission analysis. ICF prepared the emission analysis and the results of their analysis have been presented to the AQAP Technical and Advisory Roundtables.

Findings

Emissions were calculated for the Construction Staging and Phasing Plan, and the results indicate the following:

- Emissions from Construction Diesel Exhaust, namely Particulate Matter (PM) 2.5 & PM 10 will not exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) significance thresholds for any segment,
- Fugitive dust from Construction, namely PM 2.5 and PM 10 will exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds at a few segments, and
- NOx will also exceed the AQMD significance thresholds at a few segments.

None of the other pollutants analyzed by this study have any impacts on other significance thresholds.

These results were reviewed with the Roundtables and the following recommendations were made to them:

1. Concur with the findings from the Construction Staging and Phasing Emission Analysis.

2. Suggest to Caltrans that the Metro's recently adopted Green Construction policy be adopted for the construction of any major freeway work.
3. Suggest to Caltrans that a construction emission analysis be prepared for each segment (and for any segments that are being constructed concurrently) prior to actual construction proceeding. Those results are to be used to develop final recommendations so that construction of the segment does not exceed significance thresholds established at that time and that additional mitigation measures be developed to reduce any emissions to the greatest extent possible.
4. Request Caltrans to develop construction methods and staging to keep NOx emissions below significance thresholds and to develop additional watering methods as suggested in the report to reduce fugitive dust PM2.5 and PM10 from the construction of any segment.
5. Recommend that the Environmental Committee forward the I-710 Construction Staging and Phasing Emissions Analysis Report to the I-710 Project Team and Caltrans for use in the I-710 EIR/EIS.

The AQAP Technical and Advisory Roundtables reviewed these recommendations and concurred with them.

Recommended Action

It is recommended that the Environmental Committee concur with the recommendations of the AQAP Roundtables and recommend to the Transportation Committee and the COG Board to forward the report to the I-710 Project Team and Caltrans as recommended by the AQAP Roundtables.

VII. STAFF REPORTS ITEM D

I-710 HIA FINAL DRAFT REPORT

TO: Environmental Committee
FROM: Richard, Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG
BY: Jerry R. Wood, Director of Transportation and Engineering, Gateway Cities COG
SUBJECT: I-710 HIA Final Draft Report

Background

At its October 29, 2009 Meeting, the I-710 Project Committee (PC) voted unanimously to approve “linking” the Gateway Cities Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) with the I-710 EIR/EIS to include the following analyses:

1. Health Impact Assessment
2. Construction Staging and Phasing Emission Analysis
3. Near –Roadway Modeling
4. Ultrafines Research
5. Community Medical Needs Assessment

At this same meeting, the I-710 Project Committee had a presentation from members of the I-710 Community Advisory Committees (CAC) on the first three items listed above. The CAC recommended those items to the PC. The PC concurred with the CAC recommendation with two exceptions: substitute “use” for “adopt” with regard to the SCAQMD’s air quality significance thresholds and defer action on the near-roadway modeling and construction impact to the January 28, 2010 PC meeting. The CAC recommendations for near-roadway modeling also included a request to research and report back on the status of Ultrafines.

At its January 28, 2010 meeting, the PC voted to concur with the CAC’s recommendations and to ask that the HIA be included in the I-710 EIR/EIS.

Issue

The Near-Roadway Modeling Results, the Ultrafines Research Report and the Community Medical Needs Assessment were forwarded to the I-710 Project Team and Caltrans as recommended by the September, 2011, Environmental Committee (EC) Meeting and subsequently concurred with by both the Transportation Committee and the COG Board of Directors.

The Construction Staging Emissions Analysis Report was addressed previously at this EC Meeting.

Therefore, the purpose of this staff report is to provide analysis and recommendations for the remaining item requested by the PC – the HIA Draft Final Report.

Previous Actions and Work

Previously, the HIA Technical Working Group (TWG) met three times to provide input on scoping and preparation of the HIA. They recommended the following five goals for the I-710 HIA:

1. Provide I-710 decision-makers and other stakeholders with positive and negative health effects, findings and recommendations for alternatives being considered.
2. Increase stakeholder participation and understanding of the I-710 project.
3. Identify community health concerns/issues within Gateway Cities and their relationship to the I-710 Corridor Project.
4. Provide a model for future transportation and infrastructure HIAs (including evidence and utility of doing an HIA).
5. Add value to the I-710 related analyses while utilizing the I-710 EIR/EIS technical data in the HIA to the greatest extent possible to reduce redundancy.

These goals were then presented to the AQAP Advisory and Technical Roundtables, who discussed and considered the goals, without making any changes.

After establishing the goals, the HIA TWG provided input on the health determinants to be assessed in the I-710 HIA. Seventeen health determinants were proposed and evaluated resulting in a narrowing down to the following six health determinants:

- Air Quality
- Noise
- Mobility
- Traffic Safety
- Jobs and Economic Development
- Neighborhood resources (parks, food, healthcare, etc.)

Following this determination, pathways were developed to be used in assessing the health outcomes for these health determinants. . These pathways and the health determinants were then reviewed and commented on by the HIA TWG, and the Advisory and Technical Roundtables. The pathways were finalized as a result of these meetings.

The Final Draft HIA Report has been completed and key findings have been presented to the HIA TWG and the two Roundtables, including the analyses and the recommendations presented by the author – Human Impact Partners (HIP). An extensive and intense amount of work has been done by HIP, the Project Team, and the stakeholder groups, to develop the HIA. They are all to be commended on this extensive effort. This HIA is the first of its kind for a large infrastructure project. Because of this fact, COG staff believes that it is deliberate and prudent to validate this process before reaching any conclusions, recommendations or outcomes for the HIA. As indicated from the input received from the various committees and the subsequent findings, discussions, and the attached COG staff report, there are differing opinions on the

results presented in the HIA by Human Impact Partners (HIP), as well as areas of concurrence and disagreements.

Recently the National Research Council authored a study entitled: *“Improving Health in the United States: The Role of Health Impact Assessment”*. The preliminary findings from their work is summarized below:

“Although HIA is different from primary scientific research, the committee concludes that several aspects of the HIA process could benefit from peer review. Peer review could highlight overlooked issues, identify opportunities to improve data or methods, and increase the legitimacy of conclusions and their acceptance and utility in the decision-making process. A formal peer-review process would need to overcome several obstacles, such as the possible difficulties in assembling a multidisciplinary team that would be needed to perform the review, the substantial delays that could occur in the process, and the current lack of agreed-on evaluation criteria. However, an HIA is often conducted on proposals that are contested among polarized and disparate interests and stakeholders and accusations of bias can arise. Independent peer review could help to ensure that the process by which HIA is conducted and the conclusions and recommendations produced are as impartial, credible, and scientifically valid as possible. The committee notes, however, that some flexibility in the peer-review process would be necessary particularly for cases in which an HIA must be completed rapidly to be relevant to the decision that it is intended to inform.”

The National Research Council study went further in detailing ideas for incorporating HIA into the EIR/EIS process.

Findings Summary

The Executive Summary of the findings of HIP for the HIA is attached (Attachment A). The basis for these recommendations were examined in detail by the HIA TWG who had many questions, concerns and disagreements with the basis of analysis and some of the recommendations. There were strong feelings that the proportionality of the I-710 with respect to many of the HIA findings, analysis and recommendations needs to be clarified. They suggested, for example, that a preamble (Attachment B) be placed in front of the mobility section of the HIA. As a result of the TWG input, many areas of disagreement, conclusions and recommendations in the HIA were reconciled.

However, there are still areas of concern as well as unresolved issues expressed from some members of the TWG, and others who have participated in this process, including the COG staff and the Project Team, on some of the analyses and recommendations in the HIA. There are also other members of the Roundtables who support these analyses and recommendations. It has been concluded that there is not sufficient time to be able to complete the HIA within the established Project milestones, and forward it to the I-710 Project Team and Caltrans in light of this current situation. See Attachment C for a compilation of various issues where COG staff disagrees with the analyses and recommendations presented by HIP in the HIA.

The recommendation at this time is to forward the final HIA to the I-710 Project Team and Caltrans for their information only without comment from the Gateway Cities COG and to proceed to establish a peer review process to be completed as soon as is possible. This

recommendation is based on the National Research Council's study on their examinations of the role for HIA and the magnitude of the HIA for the I-710 Corridor Project. This peer review process would be designed to be transparent utilizing qualified firms and individuals. The intent would be to complete the HIA peer review prior to the end of the review period for the Draft I-710 EIR/EIS. The peer review would then result in a companion document to the HIA that could be processed through the AQAP participation process and then used as deemed appropriate as part of the comments on the Draft I-710 EIR/EIS by the Gateway Cities and other interested parties. This would be consistent with the request of the I-710 Project Committee to prepare the HIA for consideration in the I-710 EIR/EIS.

Recommended Action

It is recommended that the Environmental Committee ask the Transportation Committee and the COG Board to

- a. Acknowledge that the final draft HIA report is completed in accordance with its current schedule and forwarded to the I-710 Project Team and Caltrans. And:
- b. Authorize a peer review process (as outlined in the attached COG staff report) of the final draft HIA. And:
- c. This Peer Review shall include input and comments from the TWG and Roundtables committees. And:
- d. Through the Peer Review Process, produce a companion document to the final draft HIA report for distribution and consideration by Caltrans and others.

ATTACHMENT A
FINAL DRAFT HIA REPORT –
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
UNDER SEPARATE COVER

ATTACHMENT B
PROPOSED PREAMBLE FOR MOBILITY
SECTION
PREPARED BY
I-710 HIA TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

PREAMBLE TO MOBILITY CHAPTER RECOMMENDATIONS (proposed by TWG member)

As the population continues to grow in the region and with driving as the primary mechanism for mobility, more vehicles will be on the road with more vehicle miles travelled, more goods will need to be delivered to meet demands of a growing population, and congestion will continue to increase. The issues identified in this HIA analysis of mobility – notably that higher traffic volumes on arterials and higher speeds on the arterials and freeway will reduce active transport use - are multi-factorial and both the issues and the recommendations put forward are ubiquitous throughout the region and affect its entire road transportation system and developed urban area. Although the I-710 Corridor Project Build Alternatives achieve the primary purposes of addressing projected traffic volumes and addressing projected growth in population employment and economic activities related to goods movement, these strong regional forces still result in an increase in traffic volume on arterials, and active transport through walking and biking in the corridor will remain a challenge. Therefore, it is critically important that implementation of the recommendations to encourage active transport be addressed on a regional scale, with multiple stakeholders, multiple jurisdictions and multiple agencies collaborating, and with multiple sources of funding. Also, census data indicates that there is a strong correlation between income/socioeconomic status and utilization of public transit and active transport. Regional scale strategies must be aggressively pursued to change the perception and attractiveness of transport options other than driving. The project includes transit and multi-modal improvements as part of all the build alternatives and can provide some of the impetus for change, but its proportionality to the problem is uncertain.

ATTACHMENT C
COG STAFF REPORT – SUMMARY OF KEY
ISSUES

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Summary of Key Issues of Concern from COG Staff with I-710 HIA Final Draft

October, 2011

The preparation of the I-710 Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Final Draft is the first of its kind for a major transportation project such as the I-710 Corridor Project. The preparation of the HIA has been an extensive effort, and its preparer and the project team are to be complimented. During the preparation of the I-710 HIA, access was provided to Human Impact Partners (HIP), preparers of the HIA, to all of the technical reports for the I-710 EIR/EIS Project. These technical reports were final drafts and complete with the exception of two draft reports (a preliminary noise study and the PM 2.5/PM 10 analyses portions from the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment) that were finalized while the HIA was being prepared. Even with this massive amount of information, HIA preparers commented on numerous occasions that there was a “lack of data”. The guidelines for preparing an HIA note that the “best evidence available” is to be used. If HIA’s are “dependent” on having 100 percent of the data from a project, then perhaps they should only be prepared once a draft EIR/EIS is in circulation, or not prepared for use with any project where a comprehensive environmental document is prepared. The time period is usually only 45 to 60 days, significantly less time than the time frame allocated for the preparation of the I-710 HIA.

QUESTIONS: What is the appropriateness of an HIA for projects that already have a comprehensive EIR/EIS? When should an HIA be prepared? Should an HIA be prepared at all? These questions led to the recommendation for the peer review of the HIA (see end of report for recommendations). The peer review panel can assess the utility of when and how to prepare an HIA for a project like the I-710 Corridor Improvements, timing of the preparation for the HIA, and the need for access to data from an EIR/EIS.

For the most part, many of the recommendations from the I-710 HIA do not appear to be inconsistent with the highlights of key findings from the I-710 Draft EIR/EIS. Nonetheless, there are some major areas of concern by the COG staff with some of the key issues and findings developed in the HIA. Some of these are highlighted below. There can be a healthy discussion and disagreement on some of these differences. Many of them are subjective. This highlights another prime reason for the peer review panel, which is to provide input and direction on these issues and help us resolve them since the primary objective is to improve air quality and community health with an understanding of all of the issues.

The following highlights areas of concern for each of the six health determinants based on the analyses and recommendations from the I-710 Final Draft.

MOBILITY

HIA states: “Transportation literature indicates that mode share is likely to be dependent on traffic speeds and volumes.”

COG Staff: Reviewed the literature and other sources and determined that mode share (and use of transit) has as much (or more) to do with pricing (e.g. the cost of fuel and/or parking), transit convenience, and transit quality of service. Alternative 2 of the I-710 EIR/EIS Corridor Project (included in all of the project build alternatives) includes significant funding for Transportation Systems Management (TSM), Transportation Demand Management (TDM), multi-modal and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements previously recognizing the importance of these transportation options to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Calculations for the I-710 EIR/EIS indicate that a combination of improvements to all these other transportation modes as a result of the project reduced general-purpose traffic by about one lane's worth in each direction on the freeway. Also, some cities are adding more bike lanes and the COG cities are already coordinating with other agencies to provide more funding to add additional bike facilities, including trying to implement the Metro subregional bike plan. Congestion (inferred in the HIA conclusion that transit share will increase as a result of decreased speed and higher volumes) is only one of many reasons transit use is selected. The COG Staff believes other factors are more important than congestion. Also, transit use in Gateway Cities is already high. The Blue Line, for example, has the highest ridership of any light rail system in the country and many regional Bus Lines already have some of the highest ridership in the country.

Finally, the Urban Mobility Report 2010 prepared by Texas Transportation Institute for all of the U.S. reported that in 2009 congestion caused Urban America to travel 4.8 billion hours more and to purchase an extra 3.9 billion gallons of fuel for a congestion cost of \$115 billion. They concluded by stating the solutions are: more travel options, add capacity, manage the demand, increase efficiency of the System, manage construction and maintenance projects, determine role of pricing. The I-710 Corridor Project includes all of these options. Also, the Sustainable Communities Strategy report prepared for the Gateway Cities COG clearly showed that the Green House Gas (GHG) reductions required by SB 375 can only be achieved by improving mobility on city streets, making them more efficient and addressing congestion hot spots on the freeways. GHG reduction from increased transit use and land use changes had virtually no effect.

AIR QUALITY

HIA: Concludes that air quality will improve for all project build alternatives. However, the HIA report states that even with "these reductions in air pollution from the I-710, it is not certain that the region will be brought into compliance with PM 2.5 air quality standards." The HIA reports on mortality rates near I-710 do not discuss the uncertainties nor the margin of error associated with this type of calculation.

The report concludes that: "While we do see a reduction in many of the pollutants given the alternatives, these reductions may not reach levels that they provide significantly cleaner and healthier air for communities in the I-710 Corridor. Communities in the impacted area will likely still be impacted by I-710 emissions and ambient concentrations of harmful pollutants."

Finally, the HIA had recommended for Public Transit: "Consider fully funding transit service in the neighboring communities for future years before raising/spending funds on I-710

alternatives". The HIA also discussed an issue of residences near existing warehousing and distribution centers.

COG Staff: The I-710 EIR/EIS has a robust Air Quality/Health Analysis (AQ/HRA) for the project - the first of its kind in California. It is believed that the AQ/HRA results will show, as indicated by the HIA results, that the project will be in compliance with all significant thresholds (except for some issues with construction of the project that are being addressed separately). So why the HIA concludes that there will never be cleaner and healthier air is not clear to the COG Staff. Additionally, cleaner air must be considered in a context of regional growth where an additional 2 million residents will locate in Los Angeles County.

COG staff believes that it is not the responsibility of the I-710 project, as stated in the HIA, to bring the region into compliance with PM 2.5 air quality standards (or any other standards). If the project's results show pollution levels below significant thresholds, that result should satisfy the project's responsibility resulting in improved air quality for the communities. In fact, Alt. 6B (the use of Zero Emissions Technologies for trucks) may be one of the largest contributors to GHG reduction in the basin, making it a significant contributor to help the region achieve compliance with air quality standards.

It is unclear to the COG Staff why communities will still be impacted by I-710 emissions when the project meets, or is less than all significant thresholds. The HIA provides no supporting evidence for this findings statement. As the project's predicted pollution is less than all significant thresholds, it is unclear how HIP reached this conclusion.

With respect to funding public transit first as suggested by the HIA, the COG's SCS report and the AQ/HRA clearly demonstrate that transit improvements have very little impact on air quality but mobility improvements but new technology does. Therefore, delaying mobility projects would seem to cause more air quality problems and, if a build alternative is selected, it should proceed and would include TSM, TDM multi-modal and ITS improvements as already noted in all the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS build alternatives. Furthermore, HIP based its public transit funding scenario on an assumption that the last service changes were due to budgetary restraints and not the need to restructure service. The research citation used was biased as well as inaccurate.

With respect to proximity of warehouse, distribution centers to residential: there are only 6 locations in Gateway Cities where this appears to occur even with the high density of warehouses/distribution centers within Gateway Cities. Most of these the warehouses/distribution centers face away from the homes but this is a local city land use issue and the Gateway Cities would support any local concerns at these 6 locations as recommended in the HIA. Future local land use decisions will be guided by the adopted Gateway Cities Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS).

NOISE

HIA: Reports Caltrans/FHWA use 67dBA as an upper limit but the HIA recommends a World Health guideline of 50-55dBA (outdoor living). Figure 8-9 in the HIA report shows that only about 5.5 miles of proposed sound walls will be constructed.

COG Staff: Caltrans prepared a preliminary noise study that was incomplete but did identify potential sound wall locations next to all sensitive receptors next to the freeway. Figure 8-9 only shows the proposed sound walls that may be constructed early (from a COG analysis). All this information was provided for the preparation of the HIA. However, the HIA does not acknowledge that Caltrans did identify all the proposed sound wall locations. It is not clear why the HIA did not present that information. Caltrans did complete the final noise study the end of September, 2011 and it is currently being reviewed. In the last 25 years Caltrans has not built or improved any freeways without building sound walls next to sensitive receptors.

With respect to World Health Organization Guidelines, these figures (and they use 55dBA for outdoor areas) are targets only. A check of countries from around the world from the WHO website shows the following countries noise standards:

Argentina – 80dB
Australia – 60dBA
Europe – no noise legislation
South Africa – no noise legislation
Thailand – 70dBA

It seems clear that the WHO guidelines are just that, guidelines. WHO recommends quiet paving (already implemented by Caltrans), quieter transportation technologies (maybe zero emission trucks) and noise barriers (Caltrans current proposed plan is to build sound walls). As it appears no other countries have adopted the stringent WHO guidelines it is not clear why this should be the case for the I-710 where Caltrans has demonstrated their intent to build soundwalls and are already employing other noise reduction measures (like quiet paving)

The HIA noise section would seem to be at variance with Caltrans proposals that preliminarily identified sound walls along the entire freeway next to any sensitive receptors. This issue will be revisited after review of the final noise study by Caltrans.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

HIA: States that “higher rates of severe truck-related vehicle collision under all the alternatives are expected.” It also states that “intersection level of service and subsequent higher speeds, vehicle-vehicle collisions are likely to increase and that the number of severe collisions will also increase.”

COG Staff: Reviewed the references from the HIA used for the preceding statement and material on this subject from other sources. This additional information included the following:

- Caltrans Crash Reduction Factor Updates
- Crash Reduction Factor for Traffic

- Engineering by National cooperative Highway Research Project
- FHWA desk top reference for Crash Reduction Factor

COG staff research indicates that improving intersections as proposed by the I-710 Corridor Project will lead to more efficiency and less accidents. Improving an intersection does not mean an increase in speed. The existing accident history on the I-710 is not good as it has higher than state average at many interchanges, stretches of the freeway and for truck-related accident rates. It would seem evident that separating cars from trucks would reduce accident rates but that is not the conclusion of HIA.

Finally, Alternative 6 will improve mobility and level of service (LOS) operation so speeds will be slightly higher. However, the LOS is still high during peak periods and the average speeds will mostly be less than the posted. So the conclusion that accident rates and severity will increase does not seem well founded.

JOBS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HIA: This is a qualitative analysis. The HIA was unable to determine health impacts as a result.

Most of the recommendations make sense in the HIA and the EIR/EIS does not quantify economic impacts of the project. However, it seems like there could have been a finding from the HIA that the continued growth of the logistics industry in Gateway Cities would provide tens of thousands of jobs as reported by John Husing. That information is readily available but was not used in the HIA.

NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES

HIA: The HIA reports that “none of the alternatives being considered are likely to increase walkability, bikeability and public transit.” It goes on to say that “freeway construction was associated with disinvestment in communities along the I-710 Corridor, evidenced by, for example, low residential property values.” As a result “neighborhood wealth...are unlikely to improve.” The HIA states that because of these factors (or caused as related to I-710) the health outcomes of chronic disease associated with lack of physical activity, mental health issues, decreased lifespan and injuries and fatalities associated with negative perceptions of the corridor communities will all get worse.

The COG staff strongly disagrees with the HIA on its analyses and recommendations associated with this health determinant. There is insufficient foundation for these conclusions in the HIA. This also appears to be in disagreement with the results from the Community Medical Needs Assessment that showed the health of the communities in Gateway Cities to be at least on par with LA County (with the exception of obesity and diabetes).

Also, many of the communities are investing in themselves along I-710. To name a few: Downtown Long Beach, Paramount, Maywood, South Gate and East LA.

Finally, all the build alternatives include funding and improvements for increased use of public transit. All of the Build alternatives improve pedestrian and bicycle access across the freeway,

including improvements that will make the freeway approaches and interchange access less intimidating to walking and biking. This is not usually recommended for a freeway corridor project.

In conclusion, the COG staff has major issues and concerns with much of the analyses and conclusions in the final draft of the I-710 HIA and could not come to any agreement on them with the HIA author. However, in recognition of the magnitude and potential precedent setting nature of this HIA, it is recommended that the HIA final document be peer reviewed and for that panel to provide an independent analysis and feedback on the HIA, and report back to the COG of its finding.

The peer review panel would review and analyze the I-710 final draft HIA and prepare a written evaluation that describes the results of that evaluation. The over-riding criteria for the evaluation of the HIA will be to determine if – and to what extent – the approach and methodologies followed to prepare the HIA are consistent with the methods and recommendations for HIA's contained in the recently released report from the National Research Council (NRC) – *Improving Health in the United States: The role of Health Impact Assessment*.

Specific tasks for the peer review may include, but not limited to, the following:

1. Was the data and research used in the HIA analyses selected and evaluated using appropriate, unbiased, and scientifically-based methods?
2. Were the causal associations in the HIA between stressors and effects supported and borne out by scientific data?
3. Are the conclusions of the HIA supported by the data?
4. Are the recommendations made by the HIA consistent with the project's predicted health impacts?
5. Was there sufficient data provided to prepare the HIA?
6. What recommendations could be forwarded to I-710 EIR/EIS decision makers to assist them in selecting an alternative?
7. What could be the role of the HIA in an EIR/EIS and what is the timing for its preparation and use?
8. Was the HIA balanced in its analyses and were all sides of issues used from the research that was conducted?
9. Should other research documents have been used in the HIA, which ones and what affect might they have had on the HIA conclusion and recommendations?
10. Were other factors affecting health outcomes properly evaluated and considered in determining in defining causal linkages between the project and the health outcome?