



# South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178

(909) 396-2000 • [www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov)

July 1, 2015

SENT VIA E-MAIL AND USPS:

[ann.choi@lacity.org](mailto:ann.choi@lacity.org)

[darlene.navarrete@lacity.org](mailto:darlene.navarrete@lacity.org)

Ms. Ann Choi, Planning Assistant  
City of Los Angeles, City Hall  
Department of City Planning  
200 N. Spring Street, Room 750  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

## **Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (Draft MND) for the Proposed Residential Dwellings Located at 600 E. L St; Wilmington-Harbor City (ENV-2014-4875)**

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The following comments are meant as guidance for the Lead Agency and should be incorporated into the Final CEQA document. In the project description, the Lead Agency proposes to construct nine single family homes on a 59,179 sf vacant lot.

The proposed residences will be sited approximately 650 feet west of the BNSF rail yard. Because of the close proximity to the existing tracks, residents would be exposed to diesel particulate matter, which is a toxic air contaminant. The SCAQMD staff therefore recommends that the Lead Agency conduct a mobile source health risk assessment (HRA)<sup>1</sup> to disclose the potential health risks to the residents from trains that use the railroad.

Numerous health studies have demonstrated the potential adverse health effects of living near rail yards. As a result of these studies, the California Air Resources Board recommended in 2005 avoiding the siting of housing within 1,000 feet of a rail yard in their Land Use Handbook<sup>2</sup>. Since the time of that study, additional research has continued to build the case that the near-rail yard environment also contains elevated levels of many pollutants that adversely affect human health, including some pollutants that are unregulated (e.g., ultrafine particles) and whose potential health effects are still emerging. While the health science behind recommendations against placing new homes close to rail yards is clear, SCAQMD staff recognizes the many factors lead agencies must consider when siting new housing. Further, many mitigation measures have been proposed for other projects to reduce exposure, including building filtration systems, sound walls, vegetation barriers, etc. However, because of the potential health risks involved with this particular project, it is critical that any proposed mitigation must be carefully evaluated prior to determining if those health risks would be brought below recognized significance thresholds.

### Limits to Enhanced Filtration Units

The Lead Agency should consider the limitations of the proposed mitigation for this project (enhanced filtration) on housing residents. For example, in a study that SCAQMD conducted to investigate filters<sup>3</sup> similar to those proposed for this project, costs were expected to range from \$120 to \$240 per year to replace each filter. In addition, because the filters would not have any effectiveness unless the HVAC system is running, there may be increased energy costs to the resident. The proposed mitigation assumes that the filters operate 100 percent of the time while residents are indoors. These filters also have no ability to filter out any toxic gases from vehicle exhaust. The

---

<sup>1</sup> "Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis"  
Accessed at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/mobile-source-toxics-analysis>

<sup>2</sup> California Air Resources Board. April 2005. "Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective."  
Accessed at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm>

<sup>3</sup> This study evaluated filters rated MERV 13+ while the proposed mitigation calls for less effective MERV 12 or better filters.  
Accessed at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/aqmdpilotstudyfinalreport.pdf?sfvrsn=0>

presumed effectiveness and feasibility of this mitigation should therefore be evaluated in more detail prior to assuming that it will sufficiently alleviate near roadway exposures.

Furthermore, the Lead Agency failed to quantify the project's air quality emissions during both construction and operation. The SCAQMD adopted its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook in 1993 to assist other public agencies with the preparation of air quality analyses. The SCAQMD recommends that the Lead Agency use this Handbook as guidance to prepare an air quality analysis in the Final MND. Copies of the Handbook are available from the SCAQMD's Subscription Services Department by calling (909) 396-3720. More recent guidance developed since this Handbook was published is also available on SCAQMD's website here: [www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/hdbk.html](http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/hdbk.html). SCAQMD staff also recommends that the lead agency use the CalEEMod land use emissions software. This software has recently been updated to incorporate up-to-date state and locally approved emission factors and methodologies for estimating pollutant emissions from typical land use development. CalEEMod is the only software model maintained by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and replaces the now outdated URBEMIS. This model is available free of charge at: [www.caleemod.com](http://www.caleemod.com).

The proposed project is also adjacent to sensitive land uses<sup>4</sup> (e.g., residential dwellings exist to the north, south, east, and west of the project site); however, the Draft MND did not evaluate potential localized air quality impacts that could result from construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the SCAQMD staff recommends that the Lead Agency revise the air quality analysis to include an assessment of potential localized air quality impacts during demolition and construction of the proposed project. These potential air quality impacts should be assessed using SCAQMD's Localized Significance Methodology and compared to the localized significance thresholds specific to the project area<sup>5</sup>. Furthermore, the Lead Agency should ensure that all future projects include a localized air quality analysis if warranted. In the event that the Lead Agency determines the proposed project will result in significant localized construction air quality impacts, the SCAQMD staff recommends that the Lead Agency require mitigation to minimize these impacts to a less than significant level. Additional construction-related air quality mitigation measures are available at: [http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/MM\\_intro.html](http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/MM_intro.html)

The SCAQMD staff is available to work with the Lead Agency to address these concerns and any other air quality questions that may arise. Please contact Jack Cheng, Air Quality Specialist at (909) 396-2448, if you have any questions regarding these comments. We look forward to reviewing and providing comments for the Final IS/MND associated with this project.

Sincerely,

*Barbara Radlein*

Barbara Radlein  
Program Supervisor  
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources

BR:JC  
LAC 150618-01  
Control Number

---

<sup>4</sup> California Air Resources Board. April 2005. "Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective." Accessed at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm>

<sup>5</sup> The Localized Significance Threshold (LST) methodology and Mass Rate LST Look Up Table is available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/LST/LST.html>