

AMENDED

I-710 EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE

Thursday, January 28, 2010
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 October 29, 2009, meeting of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee
- VII. **COMMENTS BY DALE BONNER, SECRETARY OF THE BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION & HOUSING AGENCY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
- VIII. **REPORTS**
 - A. Metro Presentation on Public/Private Funding Project Study for I-710
SUGGESTED ACTION: Received and File
 - B. Zero Emission Vehicles Presentation by CalStart
SUGGESTED ACTION: Receive and File
 - C. I-710 Construction Staging Concepts Presentation
SUGGESTED ACTION: Concur with TAC Recommendation and/or Give Direction to Staff



Metro



D. I-710 CAC Recommendation Continued from the Project Committee of
October 29, 2009

SUGGESTED ACTION: Recommend concurring with the recommendations from the I-710 CAC and Project Team as outlined in the staff report for:

- a) Near-Roadway Modeling
- b) Construction Staging (Construction Impact Analysis)
- c) Air Quality Action Plan

and/or, give direction to staff.

E. 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. Traffic Modeling Reports Updated Projections Presentation
 - e. Stormwater Treatment Approach
 - f. 3-month look ahead
- 2. Environmental – Status Report
 - a. Overall Status
 - b. Other Studies
 - c. 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: Receive and file Status Reports and concur with the TAC recommendation that the higher truck projections be used and that Alternatives 6A and 6B include maximum truck volume lane assumptions and that, in addition, Alternative 6B also include an additional technology option to increase the truck volumes per lane in the freight corridor for that alternative and address the geometric needs for this option.

IX. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

X. ADJOURNMENT



Metro



VI. CONSENT CALENDAR Item A

**Approval of Minutes
October 29, 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**

October 29, 2009

I. Call to Order

Co-Chair Hurtado called the meeting to order at 6:38 PM.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by Self-Introductions

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Gil Hurtado, City of South Gate, Sergio Infanzon, City of Bell Gardens; Co-Chair; Hugo Argumedo, City of Commerce; Frank Gurule, City of Cudahy; Anne Bayer, City of Downey; Elba Guerrero, Val Lerch, City of Long Beach; Gene Daniels, City of Paramount; Larry Forester, City of Signal Hill; Pat DeChellis, County of Los Angeles; Dr. Mike Walter, Port of Long Beach; Borja Leon, Port of Los Angeles; Joe Aguilar, I-5 JPA; Doug Failing, Caltrans; Diane DuBois, MTA; Susan Seamans, SBCCOG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: George Mirabal, City of Bell; Jim Dear, City of Carson; Lillie Dobson, City of Compton; Felipe Aguirre, City of Maywood; City of Huntington Park; Maria T. Santillan, City of Lynwood; William Davis, City of Vernon; Rich Macias, SCAG; Barbara Messina, SGVCOG.

ALSO PRESENT: South Gate Councilmember Bill DeWitt; Bill Pagett, City Engineer, City of Paramount, I-710 TAC Chair; Barbara Munoz, Director of Public Works, City of Signal Hill; Phil Doudar, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; Sue Lai, Traffic Engineer, Port of Los Angeles; Larry Cottrill, Director of Master Planning, Port of Long Beach; Rick Cameron, Port of Long Beach; Jolene Hayes, Port of Long Beach; Jacki Bacharach, Executive Director, SBCCOG; Abdi Saghafi, Project Manager, Caltrans; Ron Kosinski, Deputy Director of Environmental Planning, Caltrans; Susan Gilmore, Metro; Ernesto Chavez, Transportation Planner, Metro; Dave Randall, Transportation Director, Montebello Unified School District; Peter Greenwald, South Coast Air Quality Management District; Susan Nakamura, South Coast Air Quality Management District; Richard Powers, Executive Director, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, Deputy Executive Director, GCCOG; Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy, GCCOG; Jerry Wood, GCCOG Engineer; Angelo Logan, I-710 Corridor Advisory Committee; Ian McMillan, I-710

Environmental Subject Working Group; Paul Simon, Corridor Advisory Committee; Bob Eula, City of Commerce Local Advisory Committee; Jack Waldron, Project Manager, URS; Dave Levinsohn, Deputy Project Manager, URS; Shannon Willits, Engineering Manager, URS; Rob McCann, President, LSA; Pat McLaughlin, Principal, MIG; Esmeralda Garcia, Project Manager, MIG; Jesse Froelich, MIG; Julia Lester, Environ International.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Gurule led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Guerrero, to move Item IX.E. to be the first item taken up under reports. The motion was approved unanimously.

V. Public Comments

Beatriz Reyes, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, spoke in support of the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee.

Guillermo Merin, Communities for a Better Environment, said that he desired trees to be planted along the freeway, with one tree every 25 feet, so that we can breathe some clean air.

Maria Yolanda Lopez, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said that she lives three blocks from the freeway, has a heart problem, walks every day, and feels that the air is not good for her health. She asked the Project Committee to analyze carefully the effects of construction, particularly noise, dust, and pollution.

Mark Lopez, Communities for a Better Environment, expressed concern that action is not moving forward.

April Solares, Communities for a Better Environment, spoke in support of the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee.

Yolanda Chavez, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, spoke in support of the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee and said she is concerned about the effects of the project.

Rosi Gonzalez, Youth for Environmental Justice, asked the Committee to listen to what they have to say.

VI. Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Member Guerrero, seconded by Member Forester, to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 30, 2009. The motion was approved unanimously

VII. Appointments

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Gurule, to appoint Patrick Schanen of the Los Angeles Unified School District to the I-710 Environmental Subject Working Group. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. I-710 Project Committee 2010 Meeting Schedule

It was moved by Member Guerrero, seconded by Member Forester, to establish the following dates as the meeting schedule for the Project Committee in 2010: January 28; April 29; July 29; September 30; and December 30. The motion was approved unanimously.

IX. Reports

E. Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) Recommendations

Angelo Logan gave a summary presentation of the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee that were formulated by the Environmental Subject Working Group. He said they concerned three topic areas: significance thresholds, near-source modeling, and construction impacts. He said a recommendation related to implementation of Health Impact Analysis tools was also being forwarded to the Project Committee for consideration.

Susan Nakamura, South Coast Air Quality Management District, presented the recommendation from the Corridor Advisory Committee regarding significance thresholds. She said that the recommendation from that the Corridor Advisory Committee was to use the SCAQMD significance thresholds as the thresholds to be used to meet the CEQA guidelines and that these thresholds be adopted before completion of the Air Quality Action Plan and Health Risk Assessment results. In response to a question from Ms. Nakamura, Member Failing said that Caltrans determined significance thresholds for a project on a case by case basis. He said Caltrans would agree to use the SCAQMD's significance thresholds for the I-710 project.

Dave Randall presented the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee regarding construction impacts. He said that the recommendation was to develop a staging plan with adequate time to

quantify construction impacts in the Health Risk Assessment; and to address full construction impacts from a health perspective.

Ian McMillan presented the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee regarding near-source modeling. He said the recommendations were to conduct near-roadway modeling at a level smaller than the analysis unit of a Traffic Analysis Zone as part of the air quality analysis, and to consider ambient air quality data that reflect near-roadway concentrations. He said the project consultants should continue to monitor current research on ultrafine particulates and incorporate it as appropriate.

Paul Simon presented the recommendation of the Corridor Advisory Committee that there is a need for a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment.

Julia Lester, Environ, said she wanted to be clear that construction impacts can only be estimated on a gross level, and that conducting a health risk assessment (including dispersion modeling) is not technically feasible because the project phasing is unknown. She said that action to minimize exposure to sensitive receptors can be undertaken at the time of phasing.

Yuki Kidokoro, Communities for a Better Environment, spoke in favor of the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee.

Erin Huffer, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said she supported the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee.

Madeline Clarke, East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice, spoke regarding the effects of traffic going to the rail yards which are felt by the residents of Commerce.

Robert Cabrales, Communities for a Better Environment, said he support the recommendations and asked that a presentation be made in the city of Huntington Park.

Adriano Martinez, Natural Resources Defense Council, referred the Committee to a letter from the Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice supporting the recommendations of the Community Advisory Committee. He said that he was glad that Caltrans agreed to use the SCAQMD's significance thresholds. He said the project should model different levels of cargo growth. He said he encouraged adoption of the Corridor Advisory Committee's recommendations.

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

Monica Parrilla, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said that she was concerned about pollution in the air and supported the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee.

Maria Reyes, Long Beach, said she was concerned about the health effects of living close to the freeway.

Jocelyn Vivar, East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice, read the letter from the Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice supporting the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee.

Mark Lopez, Communities for a Better Environment, asked the Committee to do everything necessary to evaluate this project.

Elina Green, UCLA Center for Environmental Health, said she strongly supported looking at health impacts in the Environmental Impact Report.

Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles, read a statement from Los Angeles Harbor Commissioner Jerilyn Lopez Mendoza supporting the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee.

Bob Eula, Commerce Local Advisory Committee, said that he wished to reiterate that the Tier II Community Advisory Committee's final document identified health as the number one priority of the project.

Martha Cota, Long Beach, said she supports the recommendation from the SCAQMD. She asked that the study consider the effects on the health of those who live near the freeway.

After discussion among the Project Committee members, it was moved by Member Lerch, seconded by Member Argumedo, to concur with the recommendations of the Corridor Advisory Committee with the following modifications: 1) substitute "use" for "adopt" with regard to SCAQMD's air quality significance thresholds; and 2) defer action on the recommendations relating to near-source modeling and construction impacts to the January meeting of the Project Committee. The motion was approved unanimously.

It was the consensus of the Project Committee to look at the construction impacts as part of the Health Risk Assessment.

Co-Chair Hurtado declared a recess of the Project Committee meeting at 9:26 p.m.

The Project Committee returned from recess at 9:40 p.m.

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

1. Status Report—Engineering

Jack Waldron, URS Project Manager, reviewed the project schedule and summarized the tasks that had been completed since the April meeting of the Project Committee. He reviewed the current tasks and studies, including value analysis, hydraulics/hydrology studies, planting design concepts, traffic operational analysis, and right of way and utility impacts.

2. Status Report—Environmental

Rob McCann, LSA, provided an update on the environmental studies. He reported that all environmental technical studies are underway according to the project schedule. He said draft studies will be based on draft geometrics and traffic analysis to date. He said the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment is being developed with extensive input from both public agencies and the I-710 local advisory committee.

3. Status Report—Community Participation

Pat McLaughlin, MIG, presented an update on the community participation activity. She reviewed past and upcoming meetings of the various local advisory committees and subject working groups.

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

B. Updated Ports' Cargo Forecast Presentation

Larry Cottrill, Director of Master Planning for the Port of Long Beach, gave a presentation regarding the ports' updated cargo forecasts. He said the San Pedro Bay Container Update was completed in July and represented a substantial reduction from the 2007 forecast. He said the year 2020 projections of the number of containers coming to and from the ports had been reduced 40% from the previous study. As a result, he said, the projections showing the ports reaching capacity have been pushed out ten to twelve years.

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

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

Jerry Wood reviewed the draft scope of work for the Gateway Cities Council of Governments Air Quality Action Plan. He reported that the draft scope of work had been reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee and others, including environmental groups, who had provided input and comments.

It was moved by Member DuBois and seconded by Member Forester to "link" the AQAP with the I-710 EIR/EIS and that the AQAP will include the following analyses:

1. Health Impact Assessment
2. Construction Phasing Impacts Analysis on Air Quality
3. Near-Roadway Modeling
4. Community Medical Needs Assessment

The motion was approved unanimously.

D. Revised TAC Recommendation Regarding Alternative 6B

Bill Pagett, Chair of the Technical Advisory Committee, presented a report from the TAC recommending a revision to Alternative 6B (widen to 10 general purpose lanes and 4 freight movement lanes for zero emission trucks). He said the TAC had approved language recommended by the South Coast Air Quality Management District to replace the last sentence in the final paragraph description of Alternative 6B to read as follows: "The design of the freight corridor will also assume possible future conversion, or initial construction, as feasible (which may require additional environmental analysis and approval), of a fixed guideway family of alternative technologies (e.g., Maglev)."

It was moved by Member Daniels, seconded by Member Forester, to approve the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee to amend the description of Alternative 6B. The motion was approved unanimously.

E. ITS Implementation Plan for Goods Movement

Jerry Wood presented a summary report on the status of an ITS Implementation Plan for goods movement that is currently being developed.

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

X. Comments from Committee Members

Jerry Wood announced that this would be the last meeting of Doug Failing as a Member of the Project Committee and that he had accepted the position of Director of Highway Programs for the MTA.

XI. Adjournment

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Daniels, to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 10:26 p.m.

VIII. Reports Item A

Metro Presentation on Public/Private Funding Project Study for I-710

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
January 28, 2010

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Metro Representative

SUBJECT: Metro Presentation on Public/Private Funding Project Study for I-710

Background

MTA has awarded a consulting contract to study the opportunity to analyze and develop potential public/private partnership funding for various transportation projects in Los Angeles County. One of those projects to be studied includes the I-710 Corridor Project. An element of this other study that will assist the preparation of the I-710 EIR/EIS will be a detailed analysis of the impact of tolling on the operations of the I-710 freeway project. A representative from MTA will make a presentation to brief the Project Committee on this study.

Recommended Action

Receive and File Report

VIII. REPORTS
Item B

Zero Emission Vehicles Presentation
by CalStart

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: Zero Emission Vehicles Presentation by CalStart

Background

Alternative 6B for the I-710 EIR/EIS is to examine a scenario in which the freight movement corridor is utilized exclusively by zero emission vehicles. At this time these vehicles are assumed to be either electric trucks or vehicles operated by an electrical-type system in the freight corridor. There is also an option included in Alternative 6B that “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”. The current design assumes zero emission trucks.

CALSTART is a nonprofit organization that works with businesses and the public sector to develop and implement clean, efficient transportation solutions. They have knowledge about all advanced fuels, technologies and vehicles and will be making a presentation on the state-of-the-art of zero emission vehicles (trucks) that might use the freight corridor in the future.

Recommended Action

Receive and File Report

VIII. REPORTS
Item C

**I-710 Construction Staging Concepts
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: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: I-710 Construction Staging Concepts Presentation

Background

At the October 29, 2009 Project Committee meeting, the CAC recommended to the Project Committee that the air quality impacts from construction staging (phasing) be included in the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment (AQ/HRA). The Project Committee continued this item to this meeting as the construction staging plans for the project were not completed until December 2009. These were reviewed with the Technical Advisory Committee to determine if reasonable construction phasing could be “inferred” from the staging plans and if, consequently, these phasing plans could be analyzed for construction air quality impacts in the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) as directed by the Project Committee at its last meeting. The presentation made to the TAC will be made to the Project Committee.

Construction staging for the project was broken into six geographic segments. Staging plans to build each one of these segments were developed and reviewed and commented upon. The TAC considered various construction phasing scenarios to construct the project (all these scenarios are a function of varying assumptions regarding funding availability) based on the construction staging concepts for each segment. They concurred with the project team’s recommendation that the “worse case” for construction impacts would be if all six segments were under construction at the same time. A conceptual construction schedule for this scenario was developed and was presented to the TAC and will be presented to the Project Committee. The conclusion of the TAC was that, **if funding was available**, the entire project could be constructed in an 8 to 10 year time frame. Another concept would be that funding would not be available for the entire project within the duration of physical construction and then it would take 16 to 20 years to build the entire project.

The following general conclusions for major construction staging and duration can be drawn for each segment:

1. In general, it will take 36 to 90 months (3 - 7.5 years) to build each segment.
2. Most of the bridges over the freeway will have to be re-built along with each interchange. Construction will have to be staged to only close one major interchange (and bridge) at a time for each segment. This will establish the sequence of construction but not the phasing.
3. Phasing will be determined by both the date funding for construction becomes available and the annual amount of those funds. A final “phasing” plan

cannot be developed until funding is finalized. Any phasing plan or approach developed without a funding plan should be considered speculative.

4. Construction timing for improvements to the freeway will depend, for many segments, on relocating major utility lines and other physical systems. Those details cannot be determined at this time but will likely influence both phasing and duration of construction as utility lines have to be relocated before major freeway construction can be started.
5. To minimize adjacent property impacts, the construction staging areas for major freeway construction will be very constrained in many segments. For Alternative 6, this will likely require the simultaneous construction of the general purpose lanes and the freight corridor in some segments.
6. Before freeway construction can be started, property will have to be acquired, the sites cleared and right-of-way certified for construction.

The project team concluded that the “worse case” for construction impacts analysis would be if all six segments were under construction at the same time, which appears to be feasible. A conceptual construction schedule for this scenario was developed and was presented to the TAC and will be presented to the Project Committee. The conclusion of the TAC was that, **if funding was available**, the entire project could be constructed in an 8 to 10 year time frame and concurred with the project team that this represents a “worse case” scenario for construction impacts air quality analysis to be conducted as part of the AQAP. Another scenario is that funding would not be available for the entire project within the duration of physical construction and then a “more likely scenario” would be that it would take 16 to 20 years to build the entire project. The TAC recommended that any analysis for construction of the project consider both this “worse case” scenario and the “more likely” scenario for phasing. The CAC supported their recommendation.

Based on the conceptual staging plans, a preliminary, feasible overall schedule for major construction of the entire I-710 project (**if funding for the entire project is available at one time**) is summarized below:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Project Element</u>
i.	Certified EIR/EIS completed
2015/2016	Complete Design
2016/2019	Property acquisition/utility relocations/right-of-way certification completed
2020/2029	Construction years (all six segments under construction at one time)

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

It appears from the preceding time line that major construction of large portions of any segments cannot be started until 2020. Analysis of each segment and its individual phases under this scenario indicates that the majority of any construction could take place between 2022 and 2025.

The TAC reviewed this material and made the following recommendations for concurrence from the Project Committee:

1. Concur with the project team that all six segments could be built simultaneously and,
2. This represents the “worse case scenario” for analyzing the air quality impacts from construction of the project and,
3. That this construction would take place in an 8 year period and that the project schedule presented was reasonable and,
4. The I-710 EIR/EIS will quantify the total construction emission but will not include AQ/HRA dispersion modeling of construction activities and,
5. That the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) will provide for the additional analysis of construction-related air quality health impacts for a “highest impact scenario” (or worse case scenario stated above) of all segments under construction in the years 2022 to 2025 along with a “more-likely construction phasing scenario” (probably 16 years total) and provide this as input into the I-710 EIR/EIS process and,
6. To make the preceding as recommendations to the I-710 Project Committee for their concurrence and the results should be used in the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS.

Recommended Action

It is recommended that the Project Committee concur with the preceding TAC and CAC recommendation and/or provide direction to staff.

VIII. REPORTS

Item D

**I-710 CAC Recommendation Continued
from the Project Committee of
October 29, 2009**

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
January 28, 2010

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director of Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: I-710 CAC Recommendation Continued from the Project Committee of November

Background

At the October 29, 2009 I-710 Project Committee meeting, the committee extended the recommendations from the I-710 CAC for construction phasing analysis and near-source modeling to its January 28 meeting. The project team and the consultants have been following up on these two items and will present recommendations to the Project Committee at the meeting. Attached to this staff report are three Exhibits (XI.A, XI.B and XI.C) on these two issues that describe the project team's analysis for these two items. Another item to be followed up from the previous Project Committee meeting generated as a result of the CAC recommendations was a motion to "link" the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) to the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS and have it address many of the CAC recommendations. The follow-up analysis of these items is presented herein.

Near-Roadway Modeling

Exhibit XI.A (attached) presents the project team's analysis of this item. This analysis was reviewed with the TAC and the CAC. The TAC had the following recommendation for this item to the Project Committee for their concurrence:

1. The results of the review and analysis of the latest near-roadway models and monitoring from the AQAP should be reported to the I-710 Project Committee and should be used in the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS.

This was also reviewed with the CAC who provided no additional comments or recommendations.

Construction Staging (Construction Impacts Analysis)

The approach to addressing construction staging and phasing is outlined with a recommended approach in the previous agenda item. Exhibit XI.C (from 10/1/09) states that the air quality impacts from the construction of the **entire** project have always been part of the environmental analysis and will be analyzed in the environmental document. As described in Exhibit XI.C, this analysis will identify the total quantity of emissions to be generated from construction.

**I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
January 28, 2010**

Draft construction staging concepts were completed for the project at the end of 2009. The results of that construction staging analysis will be presented to the Project Committee. That analysis analyzed **how** to build six different segments along the corridor. It, however, did not develop **when** those segments might be built or phased between each segment. Absent a project funding plan, it would be highly speculative to develop a phasing plan describing when each segment would be built. However, Gateway Cities COG proposes to conduct an air quality/health impact analysis of a “worse case” construction phasing scenario in the AQAP. That scenario was previously presented to the Project Committee for concurrence. The results of this analysis, from the AQAP, will be provided in a report to the I-710 Project Committee by the Gateway Cities COG in their comments on the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS.

This analysis was presented to the TAC and the CAC for review and comment. The TAC recommendations were presented above. The CAC had no additional comments or recommendations.

Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP)

The Project Committee approved the other recommendations from the CAC which included conducting a Health Impact Assessment (HIA). The direction, as indicated in the meeting minutes, is to incorporate the HIA analysis, the construction phasing options analysis and the near-roadway modeling analysis into the AQAP. Gateway Cities COG has been meeting with representatives of the I-710 Environmental Subject Working Group to finalize the approach and detail for the HIA. Per the direction of the Project Committee, the AQAP being developed by the Gateway Cities COG is to be “linked” to the I-710 EIR/EIS. In consultation with the I-710 Corridor Project Funding Partners, Gateway Cities COG recommends that the best way for this linkage to occur while still keeping the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS on schedule is to complete these analyses as part of the AQAP, report the results of these analyses to the I-710 Project Committee and by the Gateway Cities COG in providing these analyses in their comments on the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS. Direction by the Project Committee to the Gateway Cities COG staff was to also prepare a community medical needs assessment as part of the AQAP. A presentation on the status of the AQAP and these additional elements will be presented to the Project Committee at its meeting.

This presentation was also made to the TAC and CAC. The TAC concurred with this approach. The CAC moved that their original recommendation on HIA be reiterated to the Project Committee and requested that the Project Committee clarify the action taken on this item at the October 2009 meeting. Both the TAC and the CAC recommended that the analyses in the AQAP be **used** in the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS; however, this is not recommended by staff because the AQAP is an action plan with objectives that are different from and independent of the I-710 EIR/EIS.

Recommended Actions:

The following are the recommended actions for the Project Committee or as modified and/or give additional direction to staff.

Near-Roadway Modeling

Concur with the Recommendations from the I-710 CAC and Project Team (as described below) and/or Give Direction to Staff or Request Additional Information as follows:

Recommendations from the I-710 Project Team are:

1. Near-roadway criteria and air toxic pollutant modeling at a level smaller than the TAZ will be done, recognizing that it may be necessary to describe technical limitations when discussing the results and,
2. Near-roadway modeling results and near-roadway monitoring information will be reported in the EIR/EIS. The analysis will include combining the two only as described in applicable regulatory conformity guidance and practice and,
3. The I-710 AQ/HRA will include a qualitative ultrafine particulate assessment (the first ever proposed for a freeway project) and,
4. The Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) should incorporate a review and analysis of the latest near-roadway models and monitoring and the up-to-date research information (and possible analysis) of ultrafines as these AQ analysis issues can be considered and evaluated outside the regulatory constraints of a CEQA/NEPA environmental document. The results of the review and analysis will be reported to the I-710 Project Committee by the Gateway Cities COG in their comments on the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS (Staff Recommendation). The TAC and CAC recommended that the AQAP analyses should be used in the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS.

Construction Staging (Construction Impact Analysis)

Concur with the recommendations from the I-710 TAC, CAC and Project Team (as described below) and/or give direction to staff:

1. Conduct the AQ/HRA analysis of overall construction emissions of the I-710 Corridor Project as specified in the March 2009 AQ/HRA protocol (per Exhibit XI.C) and,
2. Include qualitative discussion of construction staging plans and identify measures that would minimize health-related construction impacts by minimizing exposure to construction-related emissions and,
3. The AQAP is the appropriate venue to consider the cumulative health impacts of major construction projects in the Corridor communities. This analysis in the AQAP should consider a "worse case" construction phasing scenario for the I-710 as previously recommended by the TAC. The results of this analysis will be reported to the AQAP in their comments on the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS (Staff Recommendation). The TAC and AC recommended that this analysis should be used in the I-710 Corridor Project DRAFT EIR/EIS and,

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
January 28, 2010

4. A “more likely scenario” for construction phasing also be analyzed in the AQAP as recommended by the TAC and,

Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP)

Recommend that the Air Quality Action Plan include the preceding TAC, CAC and project team recommendations for analysis and also include the HIA and Community Medical Needs Assessment analyses. It is further recommended that the results be reported to the I-710 Project Committee by the Gateway Cities COG in their comments on the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS (Staff Recommendation). The TAC and CAC recommended that the AQAP results should be used in the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS.

Mobility. Environment. Community. Economy. Technology



I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

metro.net

EXHIBIT XI.A – Near-Roadway Modeling

TO: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: I-710 Corridor Project Team

BY: ENVIRON International Corporation (AQ/HRA Consultant)

SUBJECT: Staff Report on Deferred Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC)
Recommendations to the Project Committee - Near Roadway Modeling

Introduction

The CAC submitted recommendations to the Project Committee at its October 29, 2009 meeting; the Project Committee took action on some recommendations but deferred action on three items. One of those deferred items was near-roadway modeling in the Air Quality / Health Risk Assessment (AQ/HRA).

The near-roadway modeling recommendation was originally formulated by the Environmental Subject Working Group (ESWG). At their October 15th meeting, the CAC finalized the following near-roadway modeling recommendation for the October 29th Project Committee. The CAC recommendation was in three parts:

- Near-roadway modeling at a level smaller than the analysis unit of Traffic Analysis Zone¹ (TAZ) 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.

¹ A traffic analysis zone or TAZ is an area commonly used in transportation planning models by state and/or local transportation officials for tabulating traffic-related data- especially journey-to-work and place-of-work statistics. In addition, socio-economic data can be reported for these zones. A TAZ usually consists of one or more census blocks, block groups, or census tracts. Zones can vary in size, but in this context, they are in the range of around 3,000 people and a couple of city blocks.

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
January 28, 2010

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

(The October 29th CAC presentation on this recommendation to the Project Committee is included in Attachment B of this January 28th Agenda.) The Project Committee deferred action on this recommendation until their January 28, 2010 meeting.

Background

The AQ/HRA analysis of the I-710 Corridor Project contains multiple elements, as described in detail in the March 2009 AQ/HRA Protocol.

Elements in the I-710 AQ/HRA protocol that are **typically included** in an EIR/EIS for freeway projects include:

- ✓ Carbon Monoxide (CO) quantitative assessment and local “hotspot” dispersion modeling of CO concentrations for conformity analysis
- ✓ PM2.5/PM10 (particulate matter/dust) qualitative assessment for conformity analysis
- ✓ Diesel Exhaust qualitative assessment (identify sensitive receptors)
- ✓ Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) qualitative assessment
- ✓ Construction impacts (identify standard emission/dust control measures)
- ✓ Greenhouse Gases qualitative assessment
- ✓ Construction emissions quantification (total project)

Elements in the I-710 AQ/HRA protocol that **have not been included in previous projects beyond** the typical analyses in an EIR/EIS for freeway projects include:

- ✓ Full dispersion modeling of ambient concentrations of criteria pollutants
- ✓ Full dispersion modeling for estimating concentrations of the six Priority MSATs
- ✓ Full dispersion modeling health risk assessment for the six Priority MSATs
- ✓ Quantification of operational (e.g., on-road mobile source, electric generation) greenhouse gas emissions
- ✓ Qualitative PM mortality impact assessment (based on ESWG/CAC recommendations)
- ✓ Ultrafine Particulates qualitative assessment (based on ESWG/CAC recommendations)

I-710 Project Team Analysis of CAC Near-Roadway Modeling Recommendation

The I-710 Project Team has reviewed the CAC recommendation on near-roadway modeling and prepared the following assessment.

Near-roadway modeling at a level smaller than a TAZ: The Project team wants to clarify for the Project Committee that near-roadway modeling is in fact being conducted for the I-710 AQ/HRA. Per USEPA/FHWA requirements and Caltrans Standard Environmental

**I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
January 28, 2010**

Reference (SER) guidance, carbon monoxide (CO) impacts at identified intersections will be modeled using the approved CAL3QHC line model, consistent with conformity requirements for “hot-spot” modeling. For the freeway mainline, dispersion modeling using the SCAQMD/EPA approved AERMOD model will be conducted for CEQA purposes. Other models, particularly line models, were also considered by the Project Team and AATWG but AERMOD was chosen, in part, for its ability to calculate impacts over a larger study area. (As noted above, this type of modeling for both criteria and air toxic impact assessments has not been proposed for freeway/roadway projects previously.) AERMOD calculates air quality impacts at gridded receptor points (or locations). The assessment will include calculated impacts at receptor points (or locations) near the 710 freeway. However, as noted by the AATWG and ESWG technical members, there are some recognized technical concerns about the accuracy/validity of AERMOD results when the receptors are right next to the freeway (for example, within 25 to 125 meters) as traffic emissions are modeled as “volume” sources along the freeway.

The I-710 Project Team’s analysis of this part of the CAC recommendation is as follows:

- The use of CAL3QHC (conformity “hot-spot” CO modeling) and AERMOD (CEQA analysis of incremental criteria and air toxic impacts among the Project Alternatives) was reviewed and approved by the Agency Air Technical Working Group (AATWG).
 - No alternative models have been proposed by the ESWG – the concern has been that AERMOD may have technical limitations very close to the freeway but will be used nonetheless since other potential models have their own limitations.
- ⇒ Near-roadway modeling at a level smaller than the TAZ will be done as part of the I-710 AQ/HRA, but caveats may be necessary when discussing the results (with respect to accuracy and appropriateness).

For the near-roadway analysis, consider near-roadway ambient air quality data: The existing setting section of the EIR/EIS will include a description of current air quality, based on available ambient air quality data. Where near-roadway ambient data are available, it will be described. The AQ/HRA Report and EIR/EIS will include the results of the CAL3QHC “hot-spot” CO modeling and AERMOD modeling of the alternatives, including near-roadway results (possibly subject to technical caveats described above). Based on discussion during ESWG meetings, it is the understanding of the project team that some ESWG members would like near-roadway AERMOD modeling results to be combined with near-roadway monitoring data as part of the conformity analysis for the Project.

The I-710 Project Team’s analysis of this part of the CAC recommendation is as follows:

- Conformity analysis is subject to specific federal and state laws, requirements and guidance. Caltrans also has guidance on the conformity analysis in its SER.

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
January 28, 2010

- Interpreted broadly as suggesting that monitoring data from right next to the freeway should be combined with modeling results (based on discussions by some ESWG members), this recommendation is not consistent with FHWA/EPA guidance and practice, particularly as it concerns any quantitative conformity analysis.
- As such, the Consultant Team cannot recommend implementing this recommendation in the current AQ/HRA study or in the EIR/EIS. Neither the AQ/HRA Report nor the EIR/EIS will include the combination of near-roadway ambient air quality data to model results except as described in applicable regulatory conformity guidance and practice.
 - Near-roadway modeling results and near-roadway monitoring information will be reported in the EIR/EIS.
- This type of monitoring and analysis may be more appropriate in the context of the AQAP where it can be considered outside the regulatory constraints of a formal environmental document.

Monitor ultrafines modeling research and incorporate as appropriate:

The health effects of ultrafines (particulate matter less than 0.1 microns) have been discussed extensively by the ESWG. Research on the creation and fate (i.e., emissions and dispersion modeling) of ultrafines from roadways is underway; ESWG members have provided recent scientific technical papers to the Consultant Team, which is also independently tracking this research.

The I-710 Project Team's analysis of this part of the CAC recommendation is as follows:

- ⇒ The I-710 Project Team agrees that keeping up with current developments is important. The Team has been monitoring and will continue to monitor current research on both emissions and dispersion modeling of ultrafines.
- ⇒ The I-710 Project Team will incorporate that information, as appropriate, into the **qualitative** ultrafine particulate assessment (the first proposed for a freeway project).
- ⇒ The AQAP may provide an additional venue for this issue outside the regulatory constraints of a formal environmental document.

Recommendations

Recommendations from the I-710 Project Team are:

- ⇒ Near-roadway criteria and air toxic pollutant modeling at a level smaller than the TAZ will be done, recognizing that it may be necessary to describe technical limitations when discussing the results.
- ⇒ Near-roadway modeling results and near-roadway monitoring information will be reported in the EIR/EIS. The analysis will include combining the two only as described in applicable regulatory conformity guidance and practice.
- ⇒ The I-710 Project Team will continue to monitor current research on both emissions and dispersion modeling of ultrafines and will incorporate that

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
January 28, 2010

- information, as appropriate, into the qualitative ultrafine particulate assessment (the first proposed for a freeway project).
- ⇒ The AQAP should incorporate a review and analysis of the latest near-roadway models and monitoring as an element of that study and the up-to-date research information (and possible analysis) of ultrafines as these issues can be considered and evaluated outside the regulatory constraints of a formal environmental document. The results of the review and analysis will be reported to the I-710 Project Committee and will be used by the Gateway Cities COG in their comments on the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS.

Mobility. Environment. Community. Economy. Technology



I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

metro.net

EXHIBIT XI.B – Construction Phasing

TO: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: I-710 Corridor Project Team

BY: LSA Associates, Inc. (EIR/EIS Consultant)

SUBJECT: Staff Report on Deferred Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC)
Recommendations to the Project Committee – Construction Impacts

Introduction

The CAC submitted recommendations to the Project Committee at its October 29, 2009 meeting; the Project Committee took action on some recommendations but deferred action on three items. One of those deferred items was the evaluation of construction impacts based on construction phasing in the Air Quality / Health Risk Assessment (AQ/HRA).

The recommendation on additional analysis of construction impacts was originally formulated by the Environmental Subject Working Group (ESWG). At their October 15th meeting, the CAC finalized the following recommendation on construction impacts analysis for consideration by the Project Committee at its meeting of October 29, 2009. The CAC recommendation was in two parts:

- Develop a staging plan with adequate time to quantify construction impacts in the Health Risk Assessment.
- Address full construction impacts from a health perspective.

The October 29th CAC presentation on this recommendation to the Project Committee was included in the Project Committee Agenda. The Project Committee deferred action on this recommendation until their January 28, 2010 meeting.

Background

As described in detail in the March 2009 AQ/HRA Protocol, the AQ/HRA analysis of the I-710 Corridor Project contains multiple elements, including analysis of construction impacts from the entire project. As shown in Exhibit XI.C, the evaluation of construction impacts from the entire project has always planned to consider:

Construction Equipment: The AQ/HRA Protocol (Section 3.1.1) states that emissions of criteria pollutants from construction equipment will be estimated using the emissions factors derived from the California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) OFFROAD 2007 emissions model. Similar to the Emission Factors Model (EMFAC), OFFROAD currently does not account for some regulations that have been adopted since the last release of the model. Therefore, OFFROAD factors will be adjusted by the AQ/HRA consultant (ENVIRON) to account for the impact of the CARB's more recent regulation for offroad in-use diesel vehicles (i.e., that these vehicles will generate lower emissions than currently assumed in the 2007 emission model).

Material Handling: Emissions from various construction activities in construction will be calculated using the methods and equations available in the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Analysis Handbook. This will provide an estimate of construction emissions that would occur over the duration of project construction.

Control Measures: To address construction air quality impacts, Caltrans has developed an extensive set of Best Available Control Measures that are required to be incorporated into the project construction plans and specifications. Caltrans will work closely with SCAQMD and other agencies to determine the best control measures to be applied during I-710 construction.

The issue of concern to the CAC is that the AQ/HRA protocol does not include an evaluation of construction impacts based upon project phasing. The I-710 Project Team has consistently maintained that a more detailed analysis of phase-specific emissions or a dispersion modeling analysis of criteria and/or air toxic pollutants is not possible with the funding and related information that is available now or in the foreseeable future (see Exhibit XI.C).

I-710 Project Team Analysis of CAC Construction Impacts Recommendation

The I-710 Project Team has reviewed the CAC recommendation on construction impacts and believes that further discussion of expanded construction impact analysis is possible, particularly as more information on staging becomes available. However, even with more information, construction-related impacts will only be assessed based on estimated emissions from construction of large, phased projects for purposes of general conformity review of the I-710 Corridor Project. ***Without sufficiently detailed projections of construction activity and timing, information that is extremely difficult or impossible to obtain from the construction staging information available at this stage of project development (or would be very speculative),***

calculating detailed emissions that can be input into the AERMOD model and then performing a full AQ/HRA modeling analysis of construction impacts as described by ESWG members is not technically feasible.

As more information becomes available, the I-710 Project Team will **qualitatively** discuss construction staging plans and identify measures that would minimize health-related construction impacts by minimizing exposure of sensitive receptors (such as schools) to construction-related emissions.

Lastly, the I-710 Project Team recognizes that construction-related air quality and health risk impacts are a concern to the local communities. There may be an opportunity in the Gateway Cities COG Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) to consider the cumulative health impacts of major construction projects, such as the I-710 and other projects, in the Corridor communities.

Recommendations

Recommendations from the I-710 Project Team are:

- ⇒ Conduct the AQ/HRA analysis of overall construction emissions of the I-710 Corridor Project as specified in the March 2009 AQ/HRA protocol (per Exhibit XI.C)
- ⇒ Include qualitative discussion of construction staging plans and identify measures that would minimize health-related construction impacts by minimizing exposure of sensitive receptors (such as schools) to construction-related emissions.
- ⇒ The AQAP is the appropriate venue to consider the cumulative health impacts of major construction projects, such as the I-710 and other projects, in the Corridor communities and that study should consider the possible phasing concepts approved by the TAC (with the recommended years) as a “worse-case” scenario and provide the results in a report to the I-710 Project Committee by Gateway Cities COG in their comments on the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS.



EXHIBIT XI.C – Construction Impacts

10/1/09

Evaluation of Air Quality Construction Impacts

Construction Equipment: The AQ/HRA Protocol (Section 3.1.1) states that emissions of criteria pollutants from construction equipment will be estimated using the emissions factors derived from the California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) OFFROAD 2007 emissions model. Similar to the Emission Factors Model (EMFAC), OFFROAD currently does not account for some regulations that have been adopted since the last release of the model. Therefore, OFFROAD factors will be adjusted by the AQ/HRA consultant (ENVIRON) to account for the impact of the CARB's more recent regulation for off-road in-use diesel vehicles.

Material Handling: Emissions from various material handling activities in construction will be calculated using the methods and equations available in the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Analysis Handbook. This will provide an estimate of construction emissions that would occur over the duration of project construction.

Control Measures: To address construction air quality impacts, Caltrans has developed an extensive set of Best Available Control Measures that are required to be incorporated into the project construction plans and specifications. Caltrans will work closely with SCAQMD and other agencies to determine the best control measures to be applied during I-710 construction.

Phase Specific Emissions: A more detailed analysis of phase-specific emissions or a dispersion modeling analysis of criteria and/or air toxic pollutants is not possible with the funding and related information that is available now or in the foreseeable future. Once staging concepts are developed toward the end of 2009, these may provide the information needed to develop a phasing plan. At that time, the ability to conduct an analysis of construction impacts by phase will be assessed.

VIII. REPORTS

Item E

Oral Status Report on I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

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

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
January 28, 2010

TO: I-710 Corridor Project 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 two years and is currently on schedule. The schedule will also be discussed along with a 3-month look ahead for each of these areas. Material 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. Detailed presentations on some critical studies will be made at the meeting for information purposes and updates. These presentations include:

- ❖ Traffic Projections update
- ❖ Stormwater treatment approach
- ❖ Utility Relocation Study
- ❖ Value Analysis Study results

Summary Reports

1. Engineering
2. Environmental
3. Community Participation

Recommended Action

1. Receive and File Status Reports and also,
2. Concur with the TAC and CAC recommendation to address the traffic forecasting results as follows:
 - (1) Consider further refinements of Alternative 6 to support better utilization of the Freight Corridor and hence relieve truck traffic on the I-710 General Purpose Lanes as much as possible and,
 - (2) Evaluate Alternative 6A (conventional trucks) Freight Corridor "Enhanced" capacity scenario, and
 - (3) Evaluate Alternative 6B (zero emission vehicles) Freight Corridor "Enhanced" capacity scenario, and
 - (4) Include design modifications, as required, to accommodate each enhanced capacity scenario, and
 - (5) As recommended by the CAC, include the analyses of these scenarios an examination and assessment of the number of general purpose lanes required for Alternative 6A and Alternative 6B.