-----Original Message-----
From: MikeOGaraSVANC@aol.com [mailto:MikeOGaraSVANC@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 15, 2008 5:20 PM
To: glennlopez@mednet.ucla.edumednet; kekunak62004@yahoo.com; dennis@peopleinprogress.org; jerryGEH@earthlink.net; dcorcoran@wm.com; RJZanotti@excite.com; Arturo.Gonzalez@lacity.org; ddepinto@depintomorales.com; bmorales@depintomorales.com; PIPSunValley@aol.com; Vikiburch@juno.com; GlennLopez@mednet.UCLA.edu; Mramire@wm.com; Rudy Eden
Subject: <SPAM> MATES III Draft report January report (AQMD REPORT ON SUN VALLEY INCL)

I have read the Executive Summary of the Mates III report and as an untrained layman I find it disturbing. I would like the CAC to re-hire the expert who was once before hired to give us a synopsis of the Air Quality regarding the Bradley recycling Park.
I believe her name was Debra Bright-Stevens and her company was Environmental audit Inc I believe the phone # is 714-832-8521 xt 241.
I am attaching my own synopsis of this study
Viki, Carol Please ask Arturo for a copy of this MATES III and look at it with my synopsis in hand. I am disappointed that there is not more reporting about Sun Valley A gentleman by the name of Rudy Eden was at the CAC mtg to present the data. He is senior manager of Laboratory Services
At one point in the presentation Mr Eden stated that the air quality "IN THE BASIN" had improved since the MATES II study in !996(?). He did do a disclaimer though and said the air quality is still awful. I do not believe it is possible that the air Quality in Sun Valley has improved since 1996.{ I believe the basin refers to the San Fernando Valley(?) } I understand that the additives in gasoline have worked somewhat and certainly converting the City buses and the City trash trucks to CNG and LNG have helped. However in the last 10 years the number of DIESEL trucks coming thru Sun Valley on freeway 170 and freeway 5 have dramatically increased the number of trips from the port to the inland empire and points North and East in the United States. There has also been an increase in cement and concrete trucks from the amount of new home construction going on up until recently. This study states that 84% of our air toxins come from Diesel trucks.
The purpose of my letter here is to get you the members of the CAC to have Arturo and Doug Corcoran hire Ms Bright-Stevens to give us a through analysis of all those portions of this study that deal with Sun Valley. Unfortunately there is no previous data from the past to compare this data to. However it seems they have changed their methodology for measuring some of the contaminants and they are now saying that it is most likely that air toxins in the MATES II study were under reported.
There are some scary things coming from this study about Sun Valley. I am asking for some more data from the AQMD in this request I would like to see the graphic charts in all of Chapter four blown up so we might see the contaminants quantity super imposed over a clearer map of Sun Valley, we kind of got squished into the middle of the map and you can't really see the parameters of Sun Valley.
Perhaps Ms Bright-Stevens can contact Mr Eden and they both can come to our next CAC meeting. This study is very important and should not just be swept under a rug as having been completed. We really need to know in depth what information is in here.
Thank you for your time I look forward to the response. Remember we now only have about 40 days left for public comment. Arturo could you please see if you can speed up the transcription of the minutes of the last meeting and distribute them ASAP.
Also Arturo I have not received any minutes for the last three meetings, is there a problem with the minutes??

Mike O'Gara
9301 Cayuga Ave
Sun Valley Ca. 91352
818-767-6766
fax 818-767-4329
mikeogaraSVANC@aol.com

MATES III Synopsis from Mike O'Gara

I have read the Mates III report and as an untrained layman I find it disturbing.
I am writing a Synopsis of my concerns which will are attached. We only have 60 days to make our concerns or comments

Page Es-1
Third line down of second paragraph
The study focuses on the Carcinogenic risk from exposure to air toxins. It does not estimate mortality or other health effects from particulate matter. **Can Debra bright tell us the risk from particulate matter?**

Bottom of page ES-2
The carcinogenic risk from air toxics in the basin based on the average concentrations at the fixed monitoring sites is about 1,200 per million

Page ES-3
Second paragraph
The risk at the fixed sites ranged from 870 to 1,400 per million
Fourth paragraph
The results indicate that diesel exhaust is the major contributor to air toxics risk, accounting for about 84% of the total

Paragraph five
This talks about the DIFFERENT ways they measured diesel particulate levels in Mates II and Mates III. At our meeting of the Bradley CAC, Rudy Eton? Said that overall the air is better today in Mates III than it was in Mates II However he emphasized that it needs to be a lot better. This is something our expert should comment on.
The last line in the paragraph says "Based on comparisons of the two methods, however, Mates II has likely underestimated the risk from Diesel Particulate"
This sentence is repeated in the last line on the page. I would like to hear comments from our expert on this

Page ES-4
Last line in third paragraph
"there are also higher levels of risk that track transportation corridors and freeways" we are in one
Paragraph four
Read the whole thing I do not know how this could be possible in our particular area. We keep adding diesel trucks to the companies in Sun Valley and there are more trucks coming thru Sun Valley from the port, plus more aircraft flying out and into Burbank airport. This needs a lot of Scrutiny.

Page Es-5
This is scary. Read paragraph two regarding Formaldehyde. Formaldehyde causes eye irritation and injury to nasal tissue and respiratory discomfort . All sites monitored were above exceotable levels. Now a group OEHHA is proposing to raise the acceptable level standard and then all sites would be under the acceptable level and therefore okay.
In paragraph three It says OEHHA (I don't know what that stands for or who controls or manages this group) is proposing to lower the acceptable level for Manganese effects neurobehavioral deficits in humans such as visual reaction time, eye-hand coordination, and hand steadiness.
First line in paragraph four "There is currently no technique to directly measure diesel particulates, the major contributor to risk in this study" Read thru thjis to the end of the page again it states the reasons for changing the Method used to measure things from Mates II to Mates III

Page ES-6

Paragraph six
This says that while there has been improvement in air quality regarding air toxics ",,,,,,,,,,The risks are still unacceptable and are higher near sources of emissions such as Ports and transportation corridors "(Sun Valley)
The next line is very telling. "Diesel Particulate continues to dominate the risk from air toxics, and the portion of air toxic risk attributable to diesel exhaust is increased compared to the MATES II study"
Last line in paragraph seven
"The results from this study underscore that a continued focus on reduction of toxic emissions, **Particularly from diesel engines,** is needed to reduce air toxics exposure"

Page 1-1
First paragraph
The South Coast Air Basin a highly urbanized area is home3 to about 16 million people who own and operate about 11 Million Motor Vehicles……. It also has the poorest air quality in the U,S,
Paragraph two
"There are also Environmental Justice concerns that programs designed to reduce emissions may not be effective in reducing risks from toxic air contamination in certaib ares, particularly in communities with lower income or multiple sources of air toxics"

Page 2-1
Second pargraph
Statement " "Recent reports have shown that annual averages of naphthalene are at levels hundreds to thousands of times higher than that of other PAHS.(Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons) The National Toxicology Program has listed naphthalene as a potential human carcinogen" In the list above this paragraph it states that Naphthalene was monitored in Mates III
HOWEVER In THE BACK OF THE BOOK ON PAGE 5-7 THERE IS A LIST OF THINGS THAT THEY MONITORED IN SUN VALLEY AND I DON'T FIND NAPHTHALENE

Page 2-2
Last paragraph
"the ten sites were selected with the input from the MATES Ii Technical Review Group and the Environmental Justice Task Force……" WHO ARE THEY???
Last line says " Wilmington, Compton, and Huntington Park were sites selected to examine Environmental Justice Concerns' NOT SUN VALLEY

Page 2-7
Paragraph 2.6.1 Volatile Compounds
Says levels of Benzene were lower by 50% and 1.3-butadiene down by 73% "These decreases are likely reflective of reduced emissions from vehicle turnover and use of reformulated gasoline" HOWEVER THERE IS A CAVAET AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 5-7 THAT REPORTS ON SUN VALLEY WHICH STATES LEVELS OF 1,3 BUTADIENE WERE RELATIVELY HIGHER IN SUN VALLEY

PARAGRAPH 2.6.2 Metals
Says levels of arsenic and cadium show declines BUT this may be more a result of lower reporting limits for MATES III compared to MATES II
Lead and Nickel levels were reduced except for nickel at the Wilmington Site possibly from *bunker fuel* used in ships. WHATS BUNKER FUEL??
Hexavalent chrominum seems to have decreased in Burbank BUT the chart on page 5-7 shows higher levels of Hexavalent Chrominum than Burbank. THIS STUFF COMES FROM CHROME PLATERS Rubidoux had a marked increase in Hexavalent Chrominum but they don't know why because there are no nearby sources of chromium emissions.

Page 2-8

Paragraph 2.6.3 Elemental Carbon

Again here we have some explanations of the difference in how the studies of PM-10 and PM-2.5 were conducted from MATES II and MATES III. Also they had better instruments Etc.

HOWEVER READ PARAGRAPH FOUR IN THIS SECTION IT **SAYS "For the PM-2.5 samples year 2 levels were somewhat higher than for year 1 for the sites with data for both years. This may reflect weather differences and/or an increase in emissions during the second year of the study."**

They don't show any comparisons from year 1 to year2 in Sun Valley although I am pretty sure the study was done for two years.

Page 2-9

Table 2-4 2005 Emissions of Diesel PM and EC, tons per year

PM2.5 DIESEL PM	PM2.5 EC	DPM/EC Ratio
26.06	15.17	1.72

I have no idea what information this table conveys

As shown in the table , both the CMB model and the PM2.5 emissions ratio method give higher estimates than the MATES II method. **Thus the Mates II Study method may underestimate the levels of diesel particulate**

2.6.5 Naphthalene and other PAH compounds

They mentioned earlier this compound sayng it was measured at levels of HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS of times higher than other PAHS (THIS WAS ON PAGE 2-1) they said it has been listed as a potential human carcinogen. I can't find where they monitored it in Sun Valley and I wonder why. It states that levels were on average much higher than other PAHs I am gathering from the verbage here that the study was done at Central Los Angeles and Wilmington and Rubidoux. It says "For the three sites Central Los Angeles showed the highest average levels of Naphthalene, and Rubidoux the lowest. For the sum of of the other PAHs Wilmington showed the highest levels" I certainly think if you looked into this you could find out what kind of industry would be contributing to this data

Page 2-10

Paragraph 2.7 discusses **cancer risks from air toxics**. It refers you to look at figures 2-17 and 2-18 on page 2-19 which shows a comparison chart from year one of the monitoring data of Mates III to year two of the Mates III data. It shows the comparisons of the areas monitored, which are Anaheim, Burbank, Central L.A., Compton, Fontana, North Long Beach, Rubidoux, and Wilmington. They averaged all these sites together and the average of these sites shows that the risk per million from year 1 to year 2 **increases** from 1100 to 1300. **This chart does NOT show the difference between Sun Valley from Year one to year two However the comparison between year one and year two of Burbank Shows the risk for year one is 1200 cases per million in year 1 and 1400 cases per million in year 2 in Burbank** I certainly believe the results would be the same in Sun Valley.

This leads me to conclude that my risk of getting cancer in Sun Valley has increased from year 1 to year 2

Fourth paragraph says "As shown in the charts, Diesel Particulate is the major contributor to risk. The average risk over the two years is about 1200 per million. {**MY COMMENT:This statement is true BUT why did they average the two years, when earlier in this document it was said that weather affects the amount of measurable air toxins and the first year was particularly wet (I think it rained more than twice our normal average that year) The charts on page 2-19 show the risk per thousand in year 2 is 1300. it should not be averaged. It is the results found in a year with typical rainfall.}** This compares to about 1400 per million in the Mates II study. It should be noted that different methods were used to estimate diesel particulate levels in the Mates III study, so the results are not strictly comparable. Based on the discussion above, the Mates II Study method may have underestimated the levels of diesel particulate."

Fifth paragraph

"On average***, Diesel particulate contributes about 84% of the total air toxics risk. This is a larger portion of risk compared to the Mates II estimate of about 70%. In addition to the differences in in methods for estimating diesel particulate, this may reflect a larger relative decrease in ambient levels of other toxic air contaminants compared to diesel exhaust."***

*****This is a tremendously important statement to Sun Valley I want to repeat it.
In addition to the differences in in methods for estimating diesel particulate, this may reflect a larger relative decrease in ambient levels of other toxic air contaminants compared to diesel exhaust."
My interpretation of this is we may be gaining on the war with some chaemicals in the air BUT we are not gaining at all in the amount of pollution coming from Diesel and there is an immediate plan being considered to add over 1800 DIESEL TRUCK TRIPS PER DAY IN THE COMMUNITY OF SUN VALLEY.

CHAPTER THREE page 3-4 paragraph 3.7
Second paragraph second line
"……the emissions of the carcinogenic pollutants in table 3-4 are weighted by the ratio of their cancer potency to the cancer potency of DIESEL PARTICULATE MATTER (DPM) Thus , *emissions from species less potent than DPM* (e.g. Benzene, Perchloroethylene, etc.) *are weighted less,* **while emissions from species more potent than DPM** (e.g., Hexavalent Chrominum, arsenic,etc**.) are weighed more**. DPM has a weighted factor of one

NOTE On table 5-4 in the back of the book which is labeled "Comparison of observed concentrations for the microscale and fixed site pair of Sun Valley and Burbank". There seem to be some items we need to explore. There is a column labeled **Statistically Significant** in that column the following of these chemicals are listed as being found, Benzene, hexavalent chromium and arsenic.

There are charts for each of the areas that were measured and each has the column **Statistically Significant**
This is measuring concentrations of chemicals in the air.
Under Commerce and Huntington Park Chart 5-1 there are 15 items marked yes
Under Indio and Rubidoux Chart 5-2 there are 18 items marked yes
Under San Bernardino and Fontana Chart 5-3 there are 11 items marked yes
Under Sun Valley and Burbank chart 5-4 there are 19 marked items as well as the notation at the bottom that says The Sun Valley Site showed higher levels of Hexavalent Chromium than Burbank. This may reflect the operation of near by use of hexavalent Chromium such as plating operations. Also levels of Dichlorobenzene and 1,3 butadiene were relatively higher. **Remember I just quoted you that Hexavalent Chromium is more potent than DPM**
Under Santa Ana and Anaheim Chart 5-5 there are 13 items marked
THIS TELLS ME THAT SUN VALLEY HAS MORE DIFFERENT AIR TOXINS IN OUR AIR THAT ARE RATED AS **STATISCALLY SIGNIFICANT** THAN ANY OF THE OTHER MEASURED SITES, **THAT CONCERNS ME!!**

Third paragraph
"….DPM emissions account for over 85% of the overall cancer risk The other significant compounds (i.e. Contributions> are 1,3 butadiene, benzene, and perchloroethylene. On-road and Off-road mobile sources contribute about 92% of the weighted carcinogenic risks and stationary sources contribute about 8% of the risks NOTE off road are airports and trains, ships and I forget what else is lumped in that category. We have lots of trains and Burbank airport.

Page 3-5 Paragraph 3.8
The last line in the first paragraph says "It should be noted that the difference for some pollutants, such as cadium and arsenic, are also due to lower method reporting limits in MATES III, as discussed in Chapter 2"
I don't understand this and didn't find anything in Chapter 2. AQMD please explain

Chapter four

This chapter has some maps with over laid graphs of concentrations of different air toxins They are really to snall to decipher and I would like to see a blowup of the Sun Valley area of Figure 4-2a, figure 4-2b, Figure 4-2c, figure 4-2d and especially figure 4-3 which shows the risk factor per million for cancer.

By the time I got to chapter four my brain was fried and it seemed much more technical than I could comprehend at this point

What is the quality of Sun Valley's air?? What chemicals/Air toxins do we have in our air that we should be extremely concerned about which ones should we be very concerned about and which ones should we just be concerned about.. What contributes the most to each of these concentrations how can we reduce it.

I would like the CAC to re-hire the expert who was once before hired to give us a synopsis of the Air Quality regarding the Bradley recycling Park. I believe her company is Evironmental Audit Inc and her name was Debra Bright-Stevens phone # 714-632-8521 xt 241