

Mobility. Environment. Community. Economy. Technology



I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

metro.net

I-710 Corridor Advisory Committee

Draft Protocol for the Air Quality / Health Risk Assessments

March 19, 2009



Protocol Development Overview

- Previously
 - Review of applicable guidance (CEQA, NEPA and conformity) and related protocols / project
 - Review of potential Protocol elements with Caltrans and funding partners
 - Protocol elements discussed with CAC and ESWG
 - Formation of Agency Air Technical Working Group (AATWG) and initial agency review
- Now
 - Review Draft Protocol with advisory groups for initial comments

Presentation Overview

- Goal of the I-710 AQ/HRA Protocol
 - Increased transparency, communication with stakeholders
 - Facilitate consensus on the technical approach
- “80/20” rule for proceeding with the draft Protocol
 - Draft Protocol must be “frozen” to begin the modeling analyses
- Protocol elements
 - Those with general technical consensus
 - Those not included
 - Those still under discussion
- Conclusions
- Next Steps

Elements With Technical Consensus

- Study area
 - Emissions, air quality, health risk, conformity
- Study area traffic AQ/HRA analysis
 - Model chosen for study area (AERMOD)
 - Use of agency guidance, where applicable
 - Use of 6 priority mobile source air toxics
- Conformity
 - Use Caltrans/agency-approved “hot-spot” guidance
 - CO Protocol
 - Current PM10/PM2.5 guidance
- Cumulative Impacts
 - Following Caltrans guidance



Elements Not Included

- Quantify monetary benefits / impacts for project-related PM2.5 emissions (EPA)
- Significance Determination (SCAQMD)
 - SCAQMD: Use their significance thresholds for criteria pollutants and toxics, their guidance for greenhouse gases OR Protocol should clearly state significance thresholds for the I-710 project
 - Caltrans Policy: “... analyze significance on a case-by-case basis looking at the degree and intensity of the impacts ...”

Elements Still Under Discussion

- Construction air quality/health risk assessment
 - Draft Protocol: overall construction emissions only
 - Both EPA and SCAQMD staff want full AQ/HRA for construction impact analysis
- Project phases
 - Both EPA and SCAQMD staff want analysis of impacts (construction and traffic) at interim project phase(s)
- “Near-source” impacts
 - EPA and ESWG members: Interest in also assessing impacts next to the freeways (~10 to 50 m) with other models
 - Issue also raised as it relates to conformity

Elements Still Under Discussion (cont)

- PM Mortality
 - Draft Protocol: qualitative analysis only
 - EPA: quantify PM mortality and morbidity; recommends Caltrans work with EPA and OEHHA on methodology
- Ultrafines
 - Raised by TAC, CAC, and ESWG members
 - Particular interest in near-freeway impacts, schools
 - Qualitative analysis possible
- Greenhouse gas “life-cycle” emissions
 - Draft Protocol: not recommended
 - ESWG believes issue warrants consideration

Conclusions

- Current “consensus” elements are sufficient to begin CEQA/NEPA and conformity analyses, including modeling
- Lead agency (Caltrans) and other funding partners are considering the identified elements still under discussion
- REMINDER: the Protocol is a “living document”

Next Steps

- Review Draft Protocol
 - 2nd week of March: release
 - Mid-March: Meet with TAC, CAC, and ESWG
 - April 6th: initial comments due date
- Submit the Draft Protocol
 - Mid-April: as revised, to the Project Committee so it can be “frozen”
- Begin work on AQ/HRA analyses
- Continue discussion on elements not currently in the Draft Protocol