

Jericho Moulder

From: Chase Preciado <Chase@lozeaudrury.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2026 1:46 PM
To: City Clerk; Shannon Vitale
Cc: Kylah Staley; Rebecca Davis; Leslie Reider; Emy Lipkind
Subject: Comment Re: 801 Mission Avenue Mixed-Use Project (Development Plan (RD23-00005) and Density Bonus (DB22-00008))
Attachments: 2026.05.19 SAFER Comment_801 Mission_Final.pdf

EXTERNAL MESSAGE: Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding. When in doubt, please contact CustomerCare@oceansideca.org

Dear Mayor Sanchez, Deputy Mayor Joyce, Honorable City Councilmembers, and Planner Vitale:

I hope this email finds you well. Attached please find comments of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER") regarding the Class 32 CEQA Infill Exemption for the 801 Mission Avenue Mixed-Use Project (Development Plan (RD23-00005) and Density Bonus (DB22-00008)), which is scheduled to be considered by the City Council at its May 20, 2026 meeting as Agenda Item No. 20.

If you could please confirm receipt of this email and the attached comments, it would be greatly appreciated.

Have a wonderful day!

Sincerely,

Chase Preciado (He/Him)
Legal Assistant
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 836-4200
(510) 836-4205 (fax)
chase@lozeaudrury.com



T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205

1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612

www.lozeaudrury.com
kylah@lozeaudrury.com

VIA EMAIL

May 19, 2026

Esther C. Sanchez, Mayor
Eric Joyce, Deputy Mayor
Rick Robinson, Councilmember
Jimmy Figueroa, Councilmember
Peter Weiss, Councilmember
Oceanside City Council
300 North Coast Hwy, CA 92054
cityclerk@oceansideca.org

Shannon Vitale, Planner
Development Services - Planning
Oceanside City Council
300 North Coast Hwy, CA 92054
svitale@oceansideca.org

**Re: Comment on 801 Mission Avenue Class 32 CEQA Infill Exemption
Development Plan (RD23-00005) and Density Bonus (DB22-00008), April 22,
2026 City Council Hearing Agenda Item No. 20**

Dear Mayor Sanchez, Deputy Mayor Joyce, Honorable City Councilmembers, and Planner Vitale:

This correspondence is submitted on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (“SAFER”) and its members living and/or working in and around the City of Oceanside (“City”) regarding the 801 Mission Avenue Mixed-Use Project (“Project”) and the proposed adoption of a California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) Class 32 Categorical In-Fill Exemption (“Exemption”).

SAFER’s comments are supported by air quality experts Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D, and Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg., of the environmental consulting firm Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprises (“SWAPE”). Dr. Rosenfeld’s and Mr. Hagemann’s comments and CVs are attached as Exhibit A.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project proposes a 7-story mixed-use building with 5,470 square-feet of ground floor commercial space and 230 units on a 66,000 square-foot site. The Project will also include three levels of underground parking. The Project site spans an entire city block, bound by Mission Avenue, Clementine Street, Seagaze Drive, and Nevada Street.

DISCUSSION

I. **The Project May Have a Significant Air Quality Impact from Emissions of Reactive Organic Gases/Volatile Organic Compounds, Precluding Reliance on the Class 32 Infill Exemption.**

A. The Project may result in significant emissions of reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds.

Dr. Rosenfeld and Mr. Hagemann reviewed and analyzed the Air Quality Technical Memorandum prepared by Dudek and found errors that resulted in an underestimation of emissions of reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds (“ROG/VOC”). (Ex. A, p. 3.) Dr. Rosenfeld and Mr. Hagemann corrected these errors and used the California Emissions Estimator Model (“CalEEMod”) to calculate the Project’s construction-related emissions of ROG/VOC. (*Id.*) They found that Project’s ROG/VOC emissions would be 112.29 lbs/day, exceeding the San Diego Air Quality Management District’s (“Air District”) significance threshold of 75 lbs/day, and constituting a Significant air quality impact. (*Id.*)

By failing to adequately analyze the Project’s emissions of ROG/VOC, City’s determination that the Project would not result in a significant air quality impact is not supported by substantial evidence. However, substantial evidence from Dr. Rosenfeld and Mr. Hagemann indicate that the Project may result in a significant air quality impact, precluding reliance on the Infill Exemption.

B. The Project may result in significant emissions of diesel particulate matter.

Dr. Rosenfeld and Mr. Hagemann also found that the Project may create a significant health risk to nearby residents due to the Project’s emissions of diesel particulate matter (“DPM”) during construction. (Ex. A, p. 7.) DPM is a toxic air contaminant (“TAC”) and known human carcinogen.¹ Yet, City failed to conduct a health risk assessment to determine the health impacts that would result from the Project’s emission of DPM.

Dudek’s analysis claims that the Project’s construction duration, at 14 months, would not create long-term DPM exposure and thus “would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations and impacts” (AQ/GHG Technical Report, p. 30.) However, Dr. Rosenfeld and Mr. Hagemann prepared a screening-level health risk assessment for the Project to determine the health risk the Project’s DPM emissions would pose to nearby sensitive receptors and found that the Project would result in a cancer risk of 110 per million, greatly exceeding the Air District’s cancer risk threshold for TACs, at 10 per million. (Ex. A, p. 7.) By failing to conduct a health risk assessment, City’s determination that the Project would not result significant air quality impacts is not supported by substantial evidence. However, substantial evidence from Dr. Rosenfeld and Mr. Hagemann indicates that the Project may result in a significant cancer risk, precluding reliance on the Infill Exemption.

¹ Summary: Diesel Particulate Matter Health Impacts, California Air Resources Board, Webpage, available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/summary-diesel-particulate-matter-health-impacts>

II. The Project May Have a Significant Cumulative Air Quality Impact Due to Construction of Other Nearby Projects, Precluding Reliance on the Class 32 Infill Exemption.

Under CEQA, “[a]n EIR must be prepared if the cumulative impact may be significant and the project's incremental effect, though individually limited, is cumulatively considerable. ‘Cumulatively considerable’ means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.” (14 CCR § 15064(h).)

Here, the Project may result in a cumulative air quality impact due to the construction of a number of other projects that are currently being considered or were approved by City staff within blocks of this Project, including the 401 Mission Avenue, 901 Mission Avenue, and 810 Mission Avenue projects. These proposed projects are all within a half mile of the Project Site and would each result in the emission of air pollutants that must be considered in conjunction with this Project.

In addition to calculating the emissions of ROG/VOC that would result from the Project here, Dr. Rosenfeld and Mr. Hagemann also calculated ROG/VOC emissions that would result from the 401 Mission Avenue and 810 Mission Avenue projects. Dr. Rosenfeld’s and Mr. Hagemann’s expert comments on the 401 Mission Avenue and 810 Mission Avenue projects are attached as Exhibit B and Exhibit C, respectively. Dr. Rosenfeld and Mr. Hagemann concluded that the 401 Mission Avenue project would result in 109 lbs/day of ROG emissions, exceeding the Air District’s ROG significance threshold of 75 lbs/day. Dr. Rosenfeld and Mr. Hagemann determined that the 810 Mission Avenue project would result in 77.7 lbs/day of ROG/VOC emissions, also exceeding the Air District’s significance threshold. Given that these projects may have significant air quality impacts by themselves, taken together, there may be a cumulatively considerable impact. Accordingly, the City must prepare an MND or EIR to sufficiently analyze and mitigate this potentially significant and cumulative impact.

By failing to consider these three projects in a cumulative impact analysis, the City’s conclusion that the Project will not result in any cumulative air quality impacts is not supported by substantial evidence.

CONCLUSION

SAFER respectfully requests that the City Council find that the Project does not qualify for the Infill Exemption and recommend that an EIR or mitigated negative declaration be prepared for the Project in order to analyze and mitigate significant impacts as well as ensure compliance with CEQA.

Sincerely,

Kylah Staley

Kylah Staley

EXHIBIT A



Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and
Litigation Support for the Environment

2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.
(949) 887-9013
mhagemann@swape.com

Paul E. Rosenfeld, PhD
(310) 795-2335
prosenfeld@swape.com

June 27, 2025

Kylah Staley
Lozeau | Drury LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94618

Subject: Comments on the 801 Mission Mixed-Use Development Project

Dear Ms. Staley,

We have reviewed the September 2024 Development Plan (“Development Plan”) for the 801 Mission Mixed-Use Development Project (“Project”) located in the City of Oceanside. The Project proposes demolishing two commercial buildings and constructing a seven-story mixed-use building which would include 230 apartments, 5,240 square feet of ground-floor retail and office space, and 317 parking spaces on a 1.5-acre site.

Our review concludes that the Development Plan may not properly evaluate the Project’s air quality and health risk impacts. The resulting emissions and health risk impacts associated with construction and operation estimated for the proposed Project may be underestimated and inadequately addressed. A full California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) analysis should be prepared to reassess and, if necessary, mitigate the future air quality impacts and potential health risks that the Project may have.

Air Quality

Unsubstantiated Input Parameters Used to Estimate Project Emissions

The Development Plan relies on the California Emissions Estimator Model (“CalEEMod”) Version 2022.1 to estimate the potential Project’s air quality emissions, included in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Technical Memorandum (“AG & GHG Memo”). Upon review, we believe the changes made to the construction-related and operational CalEEMod output files, titled “Mission Avenue Apartments v2 Detailed Report,” are inconsistent with information disclosed in the available Project documents.

The air quality analysis for the Project may underestimate criteria air pollutant emissions. In our opinion, a full CEQA analysis should be prepared to substantiate the changes made to the CalEEMod model and include an updated air quality analysis to re-evaluate the impacts the Project’s construction would have on local and regional air quality.

Changes to Construction Schedule

The “Mission Avenue Apartments v2 Detailed Report” model includes changes to the default construction schedule. As a result of these changes, the model includes the following construction schedule (AG & GHG Memo, pp. 194):

5.1. Construction Schedule

Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Days Per Week	Work Days per Phase
Demolition	Demolition	7/1/2024	7/28/2024	5.00	20.0
Site Preparation	Site Preparation	7/29/2024	8/12/2024	5.00	11.0
Grading	Grading	8/13/2024	9/10/2024	5.00	21.0
Building Construction	Building Construction	9/11/2024	5/5/2026	5.00	430
Paving	Paving	5/6/2026	6/2/2026	5.00	20.0
Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	6/3/2026	7/1/2026	5.00	21.0

While the Development Plan fails to include construction details, the AG & GHG Memo provides an explanation of the construction modeling, stating that “[c]onstruction scenario assumptions, including phasing, equipment mix, and vehicle trips, were based on CalEEMod default values” (p. 21). This explanation is in direct contrast with the model which includes manual changes to the construction phasing that are stated to be “based on applicant provided information” (AG & GHG Memo, pp. 215).

The justification for the changes to the construction schedule is not supported by the information provided by the available Project documents. As the CalEEMod User’s Guide requires any changes to model defaults be justified, we find that the changes to the construction schedule and the individual construction phase lengths lack adequate support.¹ Each construction phase is associated with different emissions activities, as such, altering an individual construction phase length can impact emissions estimates for specific criteria air pollutants.²

Until the individual construction phases are verified in future CEQA documents, we believe construction schedule should be left to their default values.

Changes to Construction Trips

The AQ & GHG Memo’s “Mission Avenue Apartments v2 Detailed Report” model also includes changes to the default construction trips and vehicle miles traveled values (pp. 215). As previously mentioned, the CalEEMod User’s Guide requires that any changes to model defaults be justified. The model claims that these changes were based on “applicant provided information,” while the AQ & GHG Memo states

¹ “CalEEMod User Guide.” CAPCOA, April 2022, available at: https://www.caleemod.com/documents/user-guide/01_User%20Guide.pdf, p. 1, 10.

² *Ibid.*, p. 34, Table 3.

that these values were “based on CalEEMod default values” (p. 21). Until this conflicting information is clarified in a full CEQA analysis, we believe these inputs should have been left as their default values.

Analysis Indicates a Potentially Significant Air Quality Impact

We prepared a CalEEMod model to estimate construction-related emissions for the Project, using the inputs provided in the “Mission Avenue Apartments v2 Detailed Report” model which were supported by information in the Development Plan and the AQ & GHG Memo.³ In our model we omitted the changes to the construction schedule and construction trips and vehicle miles traveled.⁴

We compared emissions to the reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds (“ROG/VOC”) threshold of 75 pounds per day (lbs/day) as referenced by the AQ & GHG Memo (p. 20, Table 3) (see table below).

SWAPE Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Estimates	
Construction	ROG/VOC (lbs/day)
AQ & GHG Memo	24
SWAPE	112.29
SDAPCD Threshold	75
Exceeds?	Yes

According to our analysis, the construction-related ROG/VOC emissions are estimated to be approximately 112.3 lbs/day, exceeding the San Diego Air Pollution Control District’s (“SDAPCD”) recommended significance threshold. This finding indicates a potentially significant air quality impact that the available Project documents did not identify or address. It is our opinion that a full CEQA analysis should be conducted to reevaluate the Project’s potential air quality impact on the environment.

Diesel Particulate Matter Emissions Inadequately Evaluated

A review of the Project documents indicates that no quantified health risk assessment (“HRA”) was conducted for either the construction or operational phases. Under CEQA, agencies must make a “reasonable effort to substantively connect a project’s air quality impacts to likely health consequences.”⁵ To comply with this requirement, a construction-phase HRA should have been performed to assess the potential health risks to nearby sensitive receptors from diesel particulate

³ See Attachment A for our CalEEMod output files.

⁴ See our comments above in the section titled “Unsubstantiated Input Parameters Used to Estimate Project Emissions.”

⁵ “Sierra Club v. County of Fresno.” Supreme Court of California, December 2018, available at: <https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/2018/s219783a.html>

matter (“DPM”) emissions generated during construction. The resulting cancer risk estimate should then be compared against the SDAPCD established threshold of 10 in one million.⁶

Screening-Level Analysis Demonstrates Potentially Significant Health Risk Impact

We conducted a screening-level risk assessment using AERSCREEN, a screening-level air quality dispersion model which uses a limited amount of site-specific information to generate maximum reasonable downwind concentrations of air contaminants to which nearby sensitive receptors may be exposed.⁷

We prepared a preliminary HRA of the potential construction health risk impacts to residential sensitive receptors from the Project using the annual particulate matter 10 (“PM₁₀”) exhaust emissions estimated in the “Mission Avenue Apartments v2” CalEEMod model, included in the AG & GHG Memo. Consistent with recommendations set forth by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (“OEHHA”), we assumed residential exposure begins during the third trimester stage of life.⁸

The “Mission Avenue Apartments v2” model indicates that construction activities will generate approximately 130.1 pounds of DPM over the 730-day construction period.⁹ The AERSCREEN model relies on a continuous average emission rate to simulate maximum downward concentrations from point, area, and volume emission sources. To account for the variability in equipment usage and truck trips over construction of the Project, we calculated an average DPM emission rate by the following equation:

$$\text{Emission Rate} \left(\frac{\text{grams}}{\text{second}} \right) = \frac{130.1 \text{ lbs}}{730 \text{ days}} \times \frac{453.6 \text{ grams}}{\text{lbs}} \times \frac{1 \text{ day}}{24 \text{ hours}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hour}}{3,600 \text{ seconds}} = \mathbf{0.0009356 \text{ g/s}}$$

Using this equation, we estimated a construction emission rate of 0.0009356 grams per second (“g/s”).

Construction was simulated as a 1.5-acre rectangular area source in AERSCREEN, with an initial vertical dimension of 1.5 meters and a maximum horizontal dimension of 110.18 meters. The minimum horizontal dimension is about 55.09 meters. A release height of three meters was selected to represent the height of stacks of operational equipment and other heavy-duty vehicles, and an initial vertical dimension of one and a half meters was used to simulate instantaneous plume dispersion upon release. An urban meteorological setting was selected with model-default inputs for wind speed and direction distribution. The population of Oceanside was obtained from U.S. 2023 Census data.¹⁰

⁶ “Toxic Air Contaminant Health Risks – Public Notification And Risk Reduction.” SDAPCD, February 2025, available at: <https://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdapcd/documents/rules/current-rules/Rule-1210.pdf>, p. 3.

⁷ “Air Quality Dispersion Modeling - Screening Models,” U.S. EPA, available at: <https://www.epa.gov/scram/air-quality-dispersion-modeling-screening-models>.

⁸ “Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments.” OEHHA, February 2015, available at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/cnrn/2015guidancemanual.pdf>, p. 8-18.

⁹ See Attachment B for health risk calculations.

¹⁰ “Oceanside.” U.S. Census Bureau, 2023, available at: <https://datacommons.org/place/geold/0653322?q=Oceanside>.

The AERSCREEN model generates maximum reasonable estimates of single-hour DPM concentrations for the Project. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“U.S. EPA”) suggests that the annualized average concentration of an air pollutant be estimated by multiplying the single-hour concentration by 10% in screening procedures.¹¹ Our AERSCREEN output files indicate the Maximally Exposed Individual Receptor (“MEIR”) is located approximately 50 meters downwind of the Project site.¹² The AG & GHG Memo states that the closest known sensitive receptors are Oceanside High School, located to the east of the Project site, and residential units located just south of the Project site (p. 29). Review of Google Earth reveals that residential units are adjacent to the Project site.^{13,14}



The single-hour concentration estimated by AERSCREEN for construction of the Project is therefore approximately $3.665 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ DPM at approximately 50 meters downwind. Multiplying this single-hour concentration by 10%, we get an annualized average concentration of $0.3665 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for Project construction.

Guidance from OEHHA and the California Air Resources Board (“CARB”) recommends the use of a standard point estimate approach, including high-point estimate (i.e. 95th percentile) breathing rates and age sensitivity factors to account for the increased sensitivity to carcinogens during early-in-life

¹¹ “Screening Procedures for Estimating the Air Quality Impact of Stationary Sources Revised.” U.S. EPA, October 1992, available at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2020-09/documents/epa-454r-92-019_ocr.pdf.

¹² See Attachment D for AERSCREEN output files.

¹³ “815 Mission Ave, Oceanside, CA 92054.” Google Earth, available at: https://earth.google.com/web/search/815+Mission+Ave,+Oceanside,+CA+92054,+USA/@33.19777132,-117.37371859,41.97748407a,687.43698167d,35y,360h,0t,0r/data=CiwiJgokCZMgbY-VmUBAEdu5rrgNmUBAGU0L8uqMV13AISbsogxAWF3AQgIIAToDCgEwQgIIAEoNCP_wEQAA.

¹⁴ Project site in red and nearest sensitive receptor in orange.

exposure and accurately assess risk for susceptible subpopulations such as children. The residential exposure parameters used for the various age groups in our screening-level HRA are as follows:

Exposure Assumptions for Residential Individual Cancer Risk						
Age Group	Breathing Rate (L/kg-day) ¹⁵	Age Sensitivity Factor ¹⁶	Exposure Duration (years)	Fraction of Time at Home ¹⁷	Exposure Frequency (days/year) ¹⁸	Exposure Time (hours/day)
3 rd Trimester	361	10	0.25	1	350	24
Infant (0 – 2)	1090	10	2	1	350	24
Child (2 – 16)	572	3	14	1	350	24
Adult (16 – 30)	261	1	14	0.73	350	24

For the inhalation pathway, the procedure requires the incorporation of several discrete variates to effectively quantify doses for each age group. Once determined, contaminant dose is multiplied by the cancer potency factor in units of inverse dose expressed in milligrams per kilogram per day (mg/kg/day⁻¹) to derive the cancer risk estimate. We used the following dose algorithm, therefore, to assess exposures:

$$Dose_{AIR,per\ age\ group} = C_{air} \times EF \times \left[\frac{BR}{BW} \right] \times A \times CF$$

where:

- Dose_{AIR} = dose by inhalation (mg/kg/day), per age group
- C_{air} = concentration of contaminant in air (µg/m³)
- EF = exposure frequency (number of days/365 days)
- BR/BW = daily breathing rate normalized to body weight (L/kg/day)
- A = inhalation absorption factor (default = 1)
- CF = conversion factor (1x10⁻⁶, µg to mg, L to m³)

We then used the following equation for each appropriate age group to calculate the overall cancer risk:

$$Cancer\ Risk_{AIR} = Dose_{AIR} \times CPF \times ASF \times FAH \times \frac{ED}{AT}$$

where:

¹⁵ “Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments.” OEHHA, February 2015, available at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crn/2015guidancemanual.pdf>.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8-5 Table 8.3.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8-5, Table 8.4.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5-24.

$Dose_{AIR}$ = dose by inhalation (mg/kg/day), per age group
 CPF = cancer potency factor, chemical-specific (mg/kg/day)⁻¹
 ASF = age sensitivity factor, per age group
 FAH = fraction of time at home, per age group (for residential receptors only)
 ED = exposure duration (years)
 AT = averaging time period over which exposure duration is averaged (always 70 years)

Consistent with the 730-day construction schedule, the annualized average concentration for construction was used for the entire third trimester of pregnancy (0.25 years) and 1.75 years of the infantile (0 – 2) stage of life. The results of our calculations are shown in the table below.

The Maximally Exposed Individual at an Existing Residential Receptor during Construction			
Age Group	Duration (years)	Concentration (ug/m3)	Cancer Risk
3rd Trimester	0.25	0.3665	4.98E-06
Infant (0 - 2)	1.75	0.3665	1.05E-04
Total Construction	2.00		1.10E-04

The estimated excess cancer risks for the 3rd trimester of pregnancy and infants at the MEIR, over the course of construction, are approximately 4.98 and 105, respectively. The excess cancer risk over the course of construction is approximately 110 in one million. The infant and net construction cancer risks exceed the SDAPCD threshold of 10 in one million, resulting in a potentially significant impact not addressed or identified by the Development Plan or associated documents.

Our analysis represents a screening-level HRA, which is known to be conservative. The purpose of the screening-level HRA is to demonstrate the potential link between project-generated emissions and adverse health risk impacts. The U.S. EPA Exposure Assessment Guidelines suggest an iterative, tiered approach to exposure assessments, starting with a simple screening-level evaluation using basic tools and conservative assumptions.¹⁹ If required, a more refined analyses with advanced models and detailed input data can follow, balancing cost and benefit.

Our screening-level HRA demonstrates that construction of the Project could result in a potentially significant health risk impact. A full CEQA analysis should therefore be prepared to include a refined HRA, as recommended by the U.S. EPA. If the refined analysis similarly reaches a determination of significant impact, then mitigation measures should be incorporated, as described in our “Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Emissions” section below.

¹⁹ “Exposure Assessment Tools by Tiers and Types - Screening-Level and Refined.” U.S. EPA, May 2024, available at: <https://www.epa.gov/expobox/exposure-assessment-tools-tiers-and-types-screening-level-and-refined>.

Mitigation

Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Emissions

As demonstrated above, the Project may result in potentially significant air quality and health risk impacts. Accordingly, future CEQA analysis is required under CEQA Guidelines § 15096(g)(2) to evaluate and implement all feasible mitigation measures to reduce the Project's emissions.

To address construction-related ROG/VOC emissions, we recommend that future CEQA review incorporate mitigation measures consistent with guidance from the California Department of Justice. These include the use of super-compliant, low-VOC paints during the architectural coating phase.²⁰

Additional best practices, employed in other land use development projects, include using pre-painted or paint-free materials where feasible, recycling excess paint, sealing paint containers to prevent evaporation, selecting low-VOC cleaning solvents, and applying coatings with high-efficiency tools such as high-pressure/low-volume sprayers or manual methods with near-100% efficiency.²¹ If ultra-low-VOC paints cannot be used, coating activities should be scheduled outside the peak smog season (July through September) to further reduce emissions.²²

The U.S. EPA also recommends calculating paint quantities in advance to minimize over-purchasing and waste.²³ Moreover, the California Department of Public Health ("CDPH") encourages the use of natural or low-emission interior materials, such as CARB-compliant wood products, and CDPH-certified flooring, to reduce occupant exposure to indoor VOCs.²⁴

To reduce DPM emissions during construction, we recommend adopting measures identified in the Southern California Association of Governments 2020 RTP/SCS Program Environmental Impact Report.²⁵ These include minimizing ground disturbance, limiting vehicle idling, implementing dust control measures such as soil stabilization and watering, covering haul trucks, and restricting travel on unpaved

²⁰ "Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act." State of California Department of Justice, September 2022, *available at*: <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/warehouse-best-practices.pdf>, p. 8 – 10.

²¹ "Banning Commerce Center Project." Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., June 2024, *available at*: <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2022090102/2>; Draft Environmental Impact Report, p. 1-7.

²² "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program." Los Angeles County Housing Element Update Program EIR. August 2021, *available at*: https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Housing_final-peir-mitigation-monitoring.pdf.

²³ "Methods for Estimating Air Emissions from Paint, Ink, and Other Coating Manufacturing Facilities." Emissions Inventory Improvement Program, February 2005, *available at*: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-08/documents/ii08_feb2005.pdf, Volume II, Chapter 8, p. 8.3-1.

²⁴ "Reducing occupant exposure to volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from indoor sources: Guidelines for building occupants." California Department of Public Health, July 1996, *available at*: https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DEODC/EHLB/IAQ/CDPH%20Document%20Library/reducing_occupant_exposure_vocs_guidelines_ADA.pdf.

²⁵ "4.0 Mitigation Measures." Connect SoCal Program Environmental Impact Report Addendum #1, September 2020, *available at*: https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/fpeir_connectsocial_addendum_4_mitigationmeasures.pdf?1606004420, p. 4.0-2 – 4.0-10; 4.0-19 – 4.0-23; See also: "Certified Final Connect SoCal Program Environmental Impact Report." SCAG, May 2020, *available at*: <https://scag.ca.gov/peir>.

roads. All construction equipment should meet Tier 4 Final emissions standards or provide documented justification if alternative equipment is used. Regular maintenance and documentation of equipment compliance should also be required. A construction traffic management plan should be developed to reduce community exposure to construction-related emissions, and the use of zero-emission technologies.

In summary, we have identified several feasible mitigation measures to reduce the Project's ROG/VOC and DPM emissions. We recommend that a full CEQA analysis be prepared to evaluate and incorporate these measures, if necessary, along with updated air quality and health risk assessments. The resulting environmental document should clearly demonstrate a commitment to implementing these measures prior to Project approval to ensure that emissions are minimized to the maximum extent feasible.

Disclaimer

SWAPE has received limited documentation regarding this project. Additional information may become available in the future; thus, we retain the right to revise or amend this report when additional information becomes available. Our professional services have been performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable environmental consultants practicing in this or similar localities at the time of service. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the scope of work, work methodologies and protocols, site conditions, analytical testing results, and findings presented. This report reflects efforts which were limited to information that was reasonably accessible at the time of the work, and may contain informational gaps, inconsistencies, or otherwise be incomplete due to the unavailability or uncertainty of information obtained or provided by third parties.

Sincerely,



Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.



Paul E. Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

Attachment A: CalEEMod Output Files
Attachment B: Health Risk Calculations
Attachment C: AERSCREEN Output Files
Attachment D: Matt Hagemann CV
Attachment E: Paul Rosenfeld CV

Mission Avenue Apartments Detailed Report

Table of Contents

1. Basic Project Information
 - 1.1. Basic Project Information
 - 1.2. Land Use Types
 - 1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector
2. Emissions Summary
 - 2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds
 - 2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated
3. Construction Emissions Details
 - 3.1. Demolition (2024) - Unmitigated
 - 3.3. Site Preparation (2024) - Unmitigated
 - 3.5. Grading (2024) - Unmitigated
 - 3.7. Building Construction (2024) - Unmitigated
 - 3.9. Building Construction (2025) - Unmitigated
 - 3.11. Paving (2025) - Unmitigated
 - 3.13. Architectural Coating (2025) - Unmitigated

4. Operations Emissions Details

4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type

4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type - Unmitigated

4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type - Unmitigated

4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species - Unmitigated

5. Activity Data

5.1. Construction Schedule

5.2. Off-Road Equipment

5.2.1. Unmitigated

5.3. Construction Vehicles

5.3.1. Unmitigated

5.4. Vehicles

5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

5.5. Architectural Coatings

5.6. Dust Mitigation

5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

5.7. Construction Paving

5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

5.18. Vegetation

5.18.1. Land Use Change

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.2. Sequestration

5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

6.1. Climate Risk Summary

6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures

7. Health and Equity Details

7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores

7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores

7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

7.4. Health & Equity Measures

7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures

8. User Changes to Default Data

1. Basic Project Information

1.1. Basic Project Information

Data Field	Value
Project Name	Mission Avenue Apartments
Construction Start Date	5/1/2024
Lead Agency	—
Land Use Scale	Project/site
Analysis Level for Defaults	County
Windspeed (m/s)	1.90
Precipitation (days)	20.6
Location	815 Mission Ave, Oceanside, CA 92054, USA
County	San Diego
City	Oceanside
Air District	San Diego County APCD
Air Basin	San Diego
TAZ	6231
EDFZ	12
Electric Utility	San Diego Gas & Electric
Gas Utility	San Diego Gas & Electric
App Version	2022.1.1.29

1.2. Land Use Types

Land Use Subtype	Size	Unit	Lot Acreage	Building Area (sq ft)	Landscape Area (sq ft)	Special Landscape Area (sq ft)	Population	Description
Apartments Mid Rise	230	Dwelling Unit	1.50	172,654	0.00	—	642	Includes lobby and amenity spaces

Strip Mall	5.47	1000sqft	0.13	5,473	0.00	—	—	Commercial Retail Space
Recreational Swimming Pool	0.56	1000sqft	0.00	565	0.00	—	—	Roof pool and spa
Unenclosed Parking with Elevator	322	Space	0.00	128,800	0.00	—	—	—
Parking Lot	22.0	Space	0.20	0.00	-1.00	—	—	—
Health Club	2.44	1000sqft	0.06	2,443	0.00	—	—	Gym

1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector

No measures selected

2. Emissions Summary

2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Un/Mit.	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	2.47	2.11	15.9	21.9	0.03	0.74	7.17	7.91	0.68	3.44	4.13	—	5,155	5,155	0.22	0.26	11.7	5,250
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	2.47	2.10	12.0	20.5	0.03	0.39	2.18	2.57	0.36	0.52	0.88	—	5,036	5,036	0.23	0.26	0.30	5,119
Average Daily (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	1.13	0.96	5.96	9.52	0.01	0.21	0.99	1.20	0.19	0.27	0.45	—	2,230	2,230	0.10	0.11	2.06	2,266
Annual (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	0.21	0.18	1.09	1.74	< 0.005	0.04	0.18	0.22	0.03	0.05	0.08	—	369	369	0.02	0.02	0.34	375

2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Year	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Daily - Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2024	2.47	2.11	15.9	21.9	0.03	0.74	7.17	7.91	0.68	3.44	4.13	—	5,155	5,155	0.22	0.26	11.7	5,250
2025	0.35	0.31	1.02	3.20	< 0.005	0.03	0.38	0.40	0.03	0.09	0.11	—	556	556	0.03	0.02	1.59	563
Daily - Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2024	2.47	2.10	12.0	20.5	0.03	0.39	2.18	2.57	0.36	0.52	0.88	—	5,036	5,036	0.23	0.26	0.30	5,119
2025	2.34	2.00	11.3	19.8	0.03	0.34	2.18	2.53	0.32	0.52	0.84	—	4,976	4,976	0.23	0.26	0.29	5,059
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2024	1.13	0.96	5.96	9.52	0.01	0.21	0.99	1.20	0.19	0.27	0.45	—	2,230	2,230	0.10	0.11	2.06	2,266
2025	0.37	0.31	1.80	3.16	< 0.005	0.06	0.33	0.38	0.05	0.08	0.13	—	768	768	0.04	0.04	0.71	781
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2024	0.21	0.18	1.09	1.74	< 0.005	0.04	0.18	0.22	0.03	0.05	0.08	—	369	369	0.02	0.02	0.34	375
2025	0.07	0.06	0.33	0.58	< 0.005	0.01	0.06	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.02	—	127	127	0.01	0.01	0.12	129

3. Construction Emissions Details

3.1. Demolition (2024) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Off-Road Equipment	1.92	1.61	15.6	16.0	0.02	0.67	—	0.67	0.62	—	0.62	—	2,494	2,494	0.10	0.02	—	2,502
Demolition	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.11	0.09	0.85	0.88	< 0.005	0.04	—	0.04	0.03	—	0.03	—	137	137	0.01	< 0.005	—	137
Demolition	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.02	0.02	0.16	0.16	< 0.005	0.01	—	0.01	0.01	—	0.01	—	22.6	22.6	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	22.7
Demolition	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.02	0.02	—	121	121	0.01	< 0.005	0.49	123
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	6.31	6.31	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	6.40
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	1.05	1.05	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.06
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.3. Site Preparation (2024) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.70	1.43	13.7	12.9	0.02	0.65	—	0.65	0.59	—	0.59	—	2,064	2,064	0.08	0.02	—	2,071
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.26	6.26	—	3.00	3.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.07	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	—	11.3	11.3	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	11.3	
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.03	0.03	—	0.02	0.02	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Off-Road Equipment	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	—	1.87	1.87	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	1.88	
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.01	0.01	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Worker	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.01	—	72.6	72.6	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.29	73.7	
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	0.38	0.38	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.38	

Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	0.06	0.06	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.06	
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.5. Grading (2024) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e	
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.96	1.65	15.9	15.4	0.02	0.74	—	0.74	0.68	—	0.68	—	2,454	2,454	0.10	0.02	—	2,462	
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.08	7.08	—	3.42	3.42	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.02	0.02	0.17	0.17	< 0.005	0.01	—	0.01	0.01	—	0.01	—	26.9	26.9	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	27.0	

Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.08	0.08	—	0.04	0.04	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	—	4.45	4.45	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	4.47
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.01	0.01	—	0.01	0.01	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.49	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.02	0.02	—	96.8	96.8	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.39	98.3
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	1.01	1.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.02
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	0.17	0.17	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.17

Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.7. Building Construction (2024) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.36	1.13	9.44	10.1	0.02	0.37	—	0.37	0.34	—	0.34	—	1,801	1,801	0.07	0.01	—	1,807
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.36	1.13	9.44	10.1	0.02	0.37	—	0.37	0.34	—	0.34	—	1,801	1,801	0.07	0.01	—	1,807
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.55	0.46	3.82	4.09	0.01	0.15	—	0.15	0.14	—	0.14	—	730	730	0.03	0.01	—	732
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Off-Road Equipment	0.10	0.08	0.70	0.75	< 0.005	0.03	—	0.03	0.03	—	0.03	—	121	121	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	121
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	1.01	0.93	0.75	11.0	0.00	0.00	1.88	1.88	0.00	0.44	0.44	—	2,155	2,155	0.10	0.08	8.66	2,189
Vendor	0.10	0.05	1.65	0.76	0.01	0.02	0.30	0.32	0.02	0.08	0.10	—	1,200	1,200	0.05	0.17	3.08	1,254
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	1.01	0.92	0.83	9.64	0.00	0.00	1.88	1.88	0.00	0.44	0.44	—	2,034	2,034	0.11	0.08	0.22	2,061
Vendor	0.10	0.05	1.71	0.79	0.01	0.02	0.30	0.32	0.02	0.08	0.10	—	1,200	1,200	0.05	0.17	0.08	1,251
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.40	0.37	0.33	3.96	0.00	0.00	0.75	0.75	0.00	0.18	0.18	—	832	832	0.04	0.03	1.51	844
Vendor	0.04	0.02	0.69	0.31	< 0.005	0.01	0.12	0.13	0.01	0.03	0.04	—	486	486	0.02	0.07	0.54	507
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.72	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.14	0.00	0.03	0.03	—	138	138	0.01	0.01	0.25	140
Vendor	0.01	< 0.005	0.13	0.06	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	0.02	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	—	80.5	80.5	< 0.005	0.01	0.09	84.0
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.9. Building Construction (2025) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.28	1.07	8.95	10.0	0.02	0.33	—	0.33	0.30	—	0.30	—	1,801	1,801	0.07	0.01	—	1,807
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.19	0.15	1.30	1.45	< 0.005	0.05	—	0.05	0.04	—	0.04	—	261	261	0.01	< 0.005	—	262
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.03	0.03	0.24	0.27	< 0.005	0.01	—	0.01	0.01	—	0.01	—	43.2	43.2	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	43.3
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.96	0.88	0.76	9.03	0.00	0.00	1.88	1.88	0.00	0.44	0.44	—	1,995	1,995	0.11	0.08	0.21	2,022
Vendor	0.10	0.05	1.63	0.75	0.01	0.02	0.30	0.32	0.02	0.08	0.10	—	1,179	1,179	0.05	0.17	0.08	1,230

Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.14	0.13	0.11	1.33	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.27	0.00	0.06	0.06	—	292	292	0.01	0.01	0.50	296
Vendor	0.01	0.01	0.23	0.11	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.04	0.05	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	—	171	171	0.01	0.02	0.19	178
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.01	—	48.3	48.3	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.08	49.0
Vendor	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.04	0.02	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	28.3	28.3	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.03	29.5
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.11. Paving (2025) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.59	0.49	4.63	6.50	0.01	0.20	—	0.20	0.19	—	0.19	—	992	992	0.04	0.01	—	995
Paving	0.05	0.05	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Off-Road Equipm	0.02	0.01	0.13	0.18	< 0.005	0.01	—	0.01	0.01	—	0.01	—	27.2	27.2	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	27.3
Paving	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	0.03	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	—	4.50	4.50	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	4.51
Paving	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.02	0.02	—	112	112	0.01	< 0.005	0.01	113
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	3.10	3.10	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	3.14
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	0.51	0.51	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.52
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.13. Architectural Coating (2025) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.15	0.13	0.88	1.14	< 0.005	0.03	—	0.03	0.03	—	0.03	—	134	134	0.01	< 0.005	—	134
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.15	0.13	0.88	1.14	< 0.005	0.03	—	0.03	0.03	—	0.03	—	134	134	0.01	< 0.005	—	134
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	0.03	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	—	3.66	3.66	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	3.67
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	—	0.61	0.61	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	0.61

Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.20	0.18	0.14	2.06	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.38	0.00	0.09	0.09	—	423	423	0.02	0.01	1.59	429	
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.19	0.18	0.15	1.81	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.38	0.00	0.09	0.09	—	399	399	0.02	0.02	0.04	404	
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	11.0	11.0	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	11.2	
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.00	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	1.83	1.83	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.85	
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

4. Operations Emissions Details

4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type

4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Vegetati	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Land Use	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Species	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	BCO2	NBCO2	CO2T	CH4	N2O	R	CO2e
---------	-----	-----	-----	----	-----	-------	-------	-------	--------	--------	--------	------	-------	------	-----	-----	---	------

Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avoided	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sequestered	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Removed	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avoided	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sequestered	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Removed	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avoided	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sequestered	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Removed	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

5. Activity Data

5.1. Construction Schedule

Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Days Per Week	Work Days per Phase	Phase Description
Demolition	Demolition	5/1/2024	5/29/2024	5.00	20.0	—
Site Preparation	Site Preparation	5/30/2024	6/1/2024	5.00	2.00	—
Grading	Grading	6/2/2024	6/7/2024	5.00	4.00	—
Building Construction	Building Construction	6/8/2024	3/15/2025	5.00	200	—
Paving	Paving	3/16/2025	3/30/2025	5.00	10.0	—
Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	3/31/2025	4/14/2025	5.00	10.0	—

5.2. Off-Road Equipment

5.2.1. Unmitigated

Phase Name	Equipment Type	Fuel Type	Engine Tier	Number per Day	Hours Per Day	Horsepower	Load Factor
Demolition	Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes	Diesel	Average	3.00	8.00	84.0	0.37
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	367	0.40
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	33.0	0.73
Site Preparation	Graders	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	148	0.41
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	Diesel	Average	1.00	7.00	367	0.40
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	84.0	0.37
Grading	Graders	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	148	0.41

Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes	Diesel	Average	2.00	7.00	84.0	0.37
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	367	0.40
Building Construction	Cranes	Diesel	Average	1.00	6.00	367	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	Diesel	Average	1.00	6.00	82.0	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	14.0	0.74
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes	Diesel	Average	1.00	6.00	84.0	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	Diesel	Average	3.00	8.00	46.0	0.45
Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	84.0	0.37
Paving	Pavers	Diesel	Average	1.00	6.00	81.0	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	89.0	0.36
Paving	Rollers	Diesel	Average	1.00	7.00	36.0	0.38
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	Diesel	Average	1.00	6.00	10.0	0.56
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	Diesel	Average	1.00	6.00	37.0	0.48

5.3. Construction Vehicles

5.3.1. Unmitigated

Phase Name	Trip Type	One-Way Trips per Day	Miles per Trip	Vehicle Mix
Demolition	—	—	—	—
Demolition	Worker	12.5	12.0	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Demolition	Vendor	—	7.63	HHDT,MHDT
Demolition	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Demolition	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT
Site Preparation	—	—	—	—
Site Preparation	Worker	7.50	12.0	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Site Preparation	Vendor	—	7.63	HHDT,MHDT

Site Preparation	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Site Preparation	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT
Grading	—	—	—	—
Grading	Worker	10.0	12.0	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Grading	Vendor	—	7.63	HHDT,MHDT
Grading	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Grading	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT
Building Construction	—	—	—	—
Building Construction	Worker	223	12.0	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Building Construction	Vendor	47.1	7.63	HHDT,MHDT
Building Construction	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Building Construction	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT
Paving	—	—	—	—
Paving	Worker	12.5	12.0	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Paving	Vendor	—	7.63	HHDT,MHDT
Paving	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Paving	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT
Architectural Coating	—	—	—	—
Architectural Coating	Worker	44.5	12.0	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Architectural Coating	Vendor	—	7.63	HHDT,MHDT
Architectural Coating	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Architectural Coating	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT

5.4. Vehicles

5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user.

5.5. Architectural Coatings

Phase Name	Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Parking Area Coated (sq ft)
------------	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------

5.6. Dust Mitigation

5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

Phase Name	Material Imported (cy)	Material Exported (cy)	Acres Graded (acres)	Material Demolished (sq. ft.)	Acres Paved (acres)
Demolition	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	—
Site Preparation	—	—	1.88	0.00	—
Grading	—	—	4.00	0.00	—
Paving	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20

5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user.

5.7. Construction Paving

Land Use	Area Paved (acres)	% Asphalt
Apartments Mid Rise	—	0%
Strip Mall	0.00	0%
Recreational Swimming Pool	0.00	0%
Unenclosed Parking with Elevator	0.00	100%
Parking Lot	0.20	100%
Health Club	0.00	0%

5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

kWh per Year and Emission Factor (lb/MWh)

Year	kWh per Year	CO2	CH4	N2O
2024	0.00	589	0.03	< 0.005

2025	0.00	589	0.03	< 0.005
------	------	-----	------	---------

5.18. Vegetation

5.18.1. Land Use Change

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

Vegetation Land Use Type	Vegetation Soil Type	Initial Acres	Final Acres
--------------------------	----------------------	---------------	-------------

5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

Biomass Cover Type	Initial Acres	Final Acres
--------------------	---------------	-------------

5.18.2. Sequestration

5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

Tree Type	Number	Electricity Saved (kWh/year)	Natural Gas Saved (btu/year)
-----------	--------	------------------------------	------------------------------

6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

6.1. Climate Risk Summary

Cal-Adapt midcentury 2040–2059 average projections for four hazards are reported below for your project location. These are under Representation Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5 which assumes GHG emissions will continue to rise strongly through 2050 and then plateau around 2100.

Climate Hazard	Result for Project Location	Unit
Temperature and Extreme Heat	7.71	annual days of extreme heat
Extreme Precipitation	2.95	annual days with precipitation above 20 mm
Sea Level Rise	—	meters of inundation depth
Wildfire	21.9	annual hectares burned

Temperature and Extreme Heat data are for grid cell in which your project are located. The projection is based on the 98th historical percentile of daily maximum/minimum temperatures from observed historical data (32 climate model ensemble from Cal-Adapt, 2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

Extreme Precipitation data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The threshold of 20 mm is equivalent to about $\frac{3}{4}$ an inch of rain, which would be light to moderate rainfall if received over a full day or heavy rain if received over a period of 2 to 4 hours. Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

Sea Level Rise data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from Radke et al. (2017), as reported in Cal-Adapt (Radke et al., 2017, CEC-500-2017-008), and consider inundation location and depth for the San Francisco Bay, the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and California coast resulting different increments of sea level rise coupled with extreme storm events. Users may select from four scenarios to view the range in potential inundation depth for the grid cell. The four scenarios are: No rise, 0.5 meter, 1.0 meter, 1.41 meters

Wildfire data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from UC Davis, as reported in Cal-Adapt (2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5), and consider historical data of climate, vegetation, population density, and large (> 400 ha) fire history. Users may select from four model simulations to view the range in potential wildfire probabilities for the grid cell. The four simulations make different assumptions about expected rainfall and temperature are: Warmer/drier (HadGEM2-ES), Cooler/wetter (CNRM-CM5), Average conditions (CanESM2), Range of different rainfall and temperature possibilities (MIROC5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

Climate Hazard	Exposure Score	Sensitivity Score	Adaptive Capacity Score	Vulnerability Score
Temperature and Extreme Heat	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Extreme Precipitation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sea Level Rise	1	0	0	N/A
Wildfire	1	0	0	N/A
Flooding	0	0	0	N/A
Drought	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Snowpack Reduction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air Quality Degradation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.

The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.

The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores do not include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

Climate Hazard	Exposure Score	Sensitivity Score	Adaptive Capacity Score	Vulnerability Score
Temperature and Extreme Heat	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Extreme Precipitation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sea Level Rise	1	1	1	2

Wildfire	1	1	1	2
Flooding	1	1	1	2
Drought	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Snowpack Reduction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air Quality Degradation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.

The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.

The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures

7. Health and Equity Details

7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores

The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.

Indicator	Result for Project Census Tract
Exposure Indicators	—
AQ-Ozone	29.9
AQ-PM	49.8
AQ-DPM	90.7
Drinking Water	54.3
Lead Risk Housing	49.8
Pesticides	0.00
Toxic Releases	15.6
Traffic	72.5
Effect Indicators	—
CleanUp Sites	42.6
Groundwater	70.3

Haz Waste Facilities/Generators	7.35
Impaired Water Bodies	83.0
Solid Waste	35.7
Sensitive Population	—
Asthma	31.1
Cardio-vascular	49.3
Low Birth Weights	15.0
Socioeconomic Factor Indicators	—
Education	52.3
Housing	50.3
Linguistic	44.4
Poverty	68.6
Unemployment	70.9

7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores

The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

Indicator	Result for Project Census Tract
Economic	—
Above Poverty	38.58591043
Employed	52.13653279
Median HI	29.38534582
Education	—
Bachelor's or higher	59.05299628
High school enrollment	0.115488259
Preschool enrollment	95.7141024
Transportation	—
Auto Access	17.29757475
Active commuting	80.14885153

Social	—
2-parent households	0.731425638
Voting	47.61965867
Neighborhood	—
Alcohol availability	4.516874118
Park access	81.35506224
Retail density	80.05902733
Supermarket access	87.25779546
Tree canopy	10.61208777
Housing	—
Homeownership	10.18863082
Housing habitability	56.62774285
Low-inc homeowner severe housing cost burden	79.66123444
Low-inc renter severe housing cost burden	80.16168356
Uncrowded housing	60.05389452
Health Outcomes	—
Insured adults	54.27948159
Arthritis	20.2
Asthma ER Admissions	38.3
High Blood Pressure	40.5
Cancer (excluding skin)	36.4
Asthma	23.6
Coronary Heart Disease	19.3
Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease	12.3
Diagnosed Diabetes	34.4
Life Expectancy at Birth	26.1
Cognitively Disabled	21.0
Physically Disabled	21.0

Heart Attack ER Admissions	36.2
Mental Health Not Good	28.5
Chronic Kidney Disease	27.1
Obesity	39.2
Pedestrian Injuries	98.6
Physical Health Not Good	32.6
Stroke	22.5
Health Risk Behaviors	—
Binge Drinking	32.5
Current Smoker	28.0
No Leisure Time for Physical Activity	38.1
Climate Change Exposures	—
Wildfire Risk	0.0
SLR Inundation Area	79.9
Children	56.6
Elderly	27.8
English Speaking	67.4
Foreign-born	16.0
Outdoor Workers	33.3
Climate Change Adaptive Capacity	—
Impervious Surface Cover	9.9
Traffic Density	92.4
Traffic Access	71.0
Other Indices	—
Hardship	44.7
Other Decision Support	—
2016 Voting	55.5

7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

Metric	Result for Project Census Tract
CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Score for Project Location (a)	51.0
Healthy Places Index Score for Project Location (b)	14.0
Project Located in a Designated Disadvantaged Community (Senate Bill 535)	No
Project Located in a Low-Income Community (Assembly Bill 1550)	Yes
Project Located in a Community Air Protection Program Community (Assembly Bill 617)	No

a: The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.

b: The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

7.4. Health & Equity Measures

No Health & Equity Measures selected.

7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

Health & Equity Evaluation Scorecard not completed.

7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures

No Health & Equity Custom Measures created.

8. User Changes to Default Data

Screen	Justification
Land Use	Consistent with the "Mission Avenue Apartments v2" model.

Construction		
2024		Total
Annual Emissions (tons/year)	0.03	Total DPM (lbs) 130.0821918
Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	0.164383562	Total DPM (g) 59005.28219
Construction Duration (days)	184	Emission Rate (g/s) 0.000935523
Total DPM (lbs)	30.24657534	Release Height (meters) 3
Total DPM (g)	13719.84658	Total Acreage 1.5
Start Date	7/1/2024	Max Horizontal (meters) 110.18
End Date	1/1/2025	Min Horizontal (meters) 55.09
Construction Days	184	Initial Vertical Dimension (meters) 1.5
		Setting Urban
		Population 170,020
		Start Date 7/1/2024
		End Date 7/1/2026
		Total Construction Days 730
		Total Years of Construction 2.00
		Total Years of Operation 28.00
2025		
Annual Emissions (tons/year)	0.04	
Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	0.219178082	
Construction Duration (days)	365	
Total DPM (lbs)	80	
Total DPM (g)	36288	
Start Date	1/1/2025	
End Date	1/1/2026	
Construction Days	365	
2026		
Annual Emissions (tons/year)	0.02	
Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	0.109589041	
Construction Duration (days)	181	
Total DPM (lbs)	19.83561644	
Total DPM (g)	8997.435616	
Start Date	1/1/2026	
End Date	7/1/2026	
Construction Days	181	

Operation	
	Emission Rate
Annual Emissions (tons/year)	
Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	0
Total DPM (lbs)	0
Emission Rate (g/s)	0
Release Height (meters)	3
Total Acreage	1.5
Max Horizontal (meters)	110.18
Min Horizontal (meters)	55.09
Initial Vertical Dimension (meters)	1.5
Setting	Urban
Population	170,020

The Maximally Exposed Individual at an Existing Residential Receptor during Construction

Age Group	Duration (years)	Concentration (ug/m3)	Cancer Risk
3rd Trimester	0.25	0.3665	4.98E-06
Infant (0 - 2)	1.75	0.3665	1.05E-04
Total Construction	2.00		1.10E-04

AERSCREEN 21112 / AERMOD 21112

06/20/25
09:26:13

TITLE: 2025.06.20_801MissionMixed-Use_Construction.out

***** AREA PARAMETERS *****

SOURCE EMISSION RATE:	0.936E-03 g/s	0.742E-02 lb/hr
AREA EMISSION RATE:	0.154E-06 g/(s-m2)	0.122E-05 lb/(hr-m2)
AREA HEIGHT:	3.00 meters	9.84 feet
AREA SOURCE LONG SIDE:	110.18 meters	361.48 feet
AREA SOURCE SHORT SIDE:	55.09 meters	180.74 feet
INITIAL VERTICAL DIMENSION:	1.50 meters	4.92 feet
RURAL OR URBAN:	URBAN	
POPULATION:	170020	
INITIAL PROBE DISTANCE =	5000. meters	16404. feet

***** BUILDING DOWNWASH PARAMETERS *****

BUILDING DOWNWASH NOT USED FOR NON-POINT SOURCES

***** FLOW SECTOR ANALYSIS *****
25 meter receptor spacing: 1. meters - 5000. meters

MAXIMUM IMPACT RECEPTOR

Zo	SURFACE	1-HR CONC	RADIAL	DIST	TEMPORAL
SECTOR	ROUGHNESS	(ug/m3)	(deg)	(m)	PERIOD
1*	1.000	3.665	0	50.0	WIN

* = worst case diagonal

***** MAKEMET METEOROLOGY PARAMETERS *****

MIN/MAX TEMPERATURE: 250.0 / 310.0 (K)

MINIMUM WIND SPEED: 0.5 m/s

ANEMOMETER HEIGHT: 10.000 meters

SURFACE CHARACTERISTICS INPUT: AERMET SEASONAL TABLES

DOMINANT SURFACE PROFILE: Urban
 DOMINANT CLIMATE TYPE: Average Moisture
 DOMINANT SEASON: Winter

ALBEDO: 0.35
 BOWEN RATIO: 1.50
 ROUGHNESS LENGTH: 1.000 (meters)

SURFACE FRICTION VELOCITY (U*) NOT ADJUSTED

METEOROLOGY CONDITIONS USED TO PREDICT OVERALL MAXIMUM IMPACT

YR MO DY JDY HR

 10 01 10 10 01

H0	U*	W*	DT/DZ	ZICNV	ZIMCH	M-O	LEN	Z0	BOWEN	ALBEDO	REF WS
-1.30	0.043	-9.000	0.020	-999.	21.	6.0	1.000	1.50	0.35	0.50	

HT	REF TA	HT
10.0	310.0	2.0

***** AERSCREEN AUTOMATED DISTANCES *****
 OVERALL MAXIMUM CONCENTRATIONS BY DISTANCE

DIST (m)	MAXIMUM 1-HR CONC (ug/m3)	DIST (m)	MAXIMUM 1-HR CONC (ug/m3)
1.00	2.803	2525.00	0.1897E-01

25.00	3.283	2550.00	0.1871E-01
50.00	3.665	2575.00	0.1847E-01
75.00	2.534	2600.00	0.1822E-01
100.00	1.633	2625.00	0.1799E-01
125.00	1.187	2650.00	0.1775E-01
150.00	0.9170	2675.00	0.1753E-01
175.00	0.7388	2700.00	0.1731E-01
200.00	0.6134	2725.00	0.1709E-01
225.00	0.5213	2750.00	0.1688E-01
250.00	0.4502	2775.00	0.1667E-01
275.00	0.3948	2800.00	0.1647E-01
300.00	0.3503	2825.00	0.1627E-01
325.00	0.3137	2850.00	0.1607E-01
350.00	0.2833	2875.00	0.1588E-01
375.00	0.2577	2900.00	0.1569E-01
400.00	0.2358	2925.00	0.1551E-01
425.00	0.2169	2950.00	0.1533E-01
450.00	0.2005	2975.00	0.1515E-01
475.00	0.1862	3000.00	0.1498E-01
500.00	0.1736	3025.00	0.1481E-01
525.00	0.1624	3050.00	0.1465E-01
550.00	0.1524	3075.00	0.1448E-01
575.00	0.1433	3100.00	0.1432E-01
600.00	0.1352	3125.00	0.1417E-01
625.00	0.1278	3150.00	0.1401E-01
650.00	0.1211	3175.00	0.1386E-01
675.00	0.1150	3200.00	0.1371E-01
700.00	0.1094	3225.00	0.1357E-01
725.00	0.1043	3250.00	0.1343E-01
750.00	0.9959E-01	3275.00	0.1329E-01
775.00	0.9523E-01	3300.00	0.1315E-01
800.00	0.9119E-01	3325.00	0.1301E-01
825.00	0.8745E-01	3350.00	0.1288E-01
850.00	0.8396E-01	3375.00	0.1275E-01
875.00	0.8071E-01	3400.00	0.1262E-01
900.00	0.7768E-01	3425.00	0.1250E-01
925.00	0.7483E-01	3450.00	0.1237E-01
950.00	0.7215E-01	3475.00	0.1225E-01
975.00	0.6964E-01	3500.00	0.1213E-01
1000.00	0.6726E-01	3525.00	0.1201E-01
1025.00	0.6530E-01	3550.00	0.1190E-01
1050.00	0.6317E-01	3575.00	0.1179E-01
1075.00	0.6116E-01	3600.00	0.1167E-01
1100.00	0.5926E-01	3625.00	0.1156E-01
1125.00	0.5746E-01	3650.00	0.1145E-01
1150.00	0.5575E-01	3675.00	0.1135E-01
1175.00	0.5413E-01	3700.00	0.1124E-01
1200.00	0.5259E-01	3724.99	0.1114E-01
1225.00	0.5112E-01	3750.00	0.1104E-01
1250.00	0.4972E-01	3775.00	0.1094E-01

1275.00	0.4839E-01	3800.00	0.1084E-01
1300.00	0.4712E-01	3825.00	0.1074E-01
1325.00	0.4590E-01	3850.00	0.1065E-01
1350.00	0.4474E-01	3875.00	0.1055E-01
1375.00	0.4363E-01	3900.00	0.1046E-01
1400.00	0.4256E-01	3925.00	0.1037E-01
1425.00	0.4154E-01	3950.00	0.1028E-01
1450.00	0.4056E-01	3975.00	0.1019E-01
1475.00	0.3962E-01	4000.00	0.1011E-01
1500.00	0.3872E-01	4025.00	0.1002E-01
1525.00	0.3785E-01	4050.00	0.9936E-02
1550.00	0.3702E-01	4075.00	0.9852E-02
1575.00	0.3621E-01	4100.00	0.9770E-02
1600.00	0.3544E-01	4125.00	0.9689E-02
1625.00	0.3470E-01	4149.99	0.9610E-02
1650.00	0.3398E-01	4175.00	0.9531E-02
1675.00	0.3328E-01	4200.00	0.9453E-02
1700.00	0.3261E-01	4225.00	0.9377E-02
1725.00	0.3197E-01	4250.00	0.9302E-02
1750.00	0.3134E-01	4275.00	0.9227E-02
1775.00	0.3074E-01	4300.00	0.9154E-02
1800.00	0.3016E-01	4325.00	0.9082E-02
1824.99	0.2959E-01	4350.00	0.9010E-02
1850.00	0.2905E-01	4375.00	0.8940E-02
1875.00	0.2852E-01	4400.00	0.8871E-02
1900.00	0.2800E-01	4425.00	0.8802E-02
1924.99	0.2751E-01	4450.00	0.8735E-02
1950.00	0.2702E-01	4475.00	0.8668E-02
1975.00	0.2656E-01	4500.00	0.8602E-02
2000.00	0.2610E-01	4525.00	0.8537E-02
2025.00	0.2566E-01	4550.00	0.8473E-02
2050.00	0.2523E-01	4575.00	0.8410E-02
2075.00	0.2482E-01	4600.00	0.8347E-02
2100.00	0.2442E-01	4625.00	0.8286E-02
2125.00	0.2402E-01	4650.00	0.8225E-02
2150.00	0.2364E-01	4675.00	0.8165E-02
2175.00	0.2327E-01	4700.00	0.8105E-02
2200.00	0.2291E-01	4725.00	0.8047E-02
2225.00	0.2256E-01	4750.00	0.7989E-02
2250.00	0.2221E-01	4775.00	0.7932E-02
2275.00	0.2188E-01	4800.00	0.7875E-02
2300.00	0.2156E-01	4825.00	0.7819E-02
2325.00	0.2124E-01	4850.00	0.7764E-02
2350.00	0.2093E-01	4875.00	0.7710E-02
2375.00	0.2063E-01	4900.00	0.7656E-02
2400.00	0.2033E-01	4924.99	0.7603E-02
2425.00	0.2005E-01	4950.00	0.7551E-02
2449.99	0.1977E-01	4975.00	0.7499E-02
2475.00	0.1950E-01	5000.00	0.7448E-02
2500.00	0.1923E-01		

 ***** AERSCREEN MAXIMUM IMPACT SUMMARY *****

3-hour, 8-hour, and 24-hour scaled concentrations are equal to the 1-hour concentration as referenced in SCREENING PROCEDURES FOR ESTIMATING THE AIR QUALITY IMPACT OF STATIONARY SOURCES, REVISED (Section 4.5.4)
 Report number EPA-454/R-92-019
http://www.epa.gov/scram001/guidance_permit.htm
 under Screening Guidance

CALCULATION PROCEDURE	MAXIMUM 1-HOUR CONC (ug/m3)	SCALED 3-HOUR CONC (ug/m3)	SCALED 8-HOUR CONC (ug/m3)	SCALED 24-HOUR CONC (ug/m3)	SCALED ANNUAL CONC (ug/m3)
FLAT TERRAIN	3.736	3.736	3.736	3.736	N/A
DISTANCE FROM SOURCE	56.00 meters				
IMPACT AT THE AMBIENT BOUNDARY	2.803	2.803	2.803	2.803	N/A
DISTANCE FROM SOURCE	1.00 meters				



2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.
(949) 887-9013
mhagemann@swape.com

Matthew F. Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg., QSD, QSP

**Geologic and Hydrogeologic Characterization
Investigation and Remediation Strategies
Litigation Support and Testifying Expert
Industrial Stormwater Compliance
CEQA Review**

Education:

M.S. Degree, Geology, California State University Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 1984.

B.A. Degree, Geology, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA, 1982.

Professional Certifications:

California Professional Geologist

California Certified Hydrogeologist

Qualified SWPPP Developer and Practitioner

Professional Experience:

Matt has 30 years of experience in environmental policy, contaminant assessment and remediation, stormwater compliance, and CEQA review. He spent nine years with the U.S. EPA in the RCRA and Superfund programs and served as EPA's Senior Science Policy Advisor in the Western Regional Office where he identified emerging threats to groundwater from perchlorate and MTBE. While with EPA, Matt also served as a Senior Hydrogeologist in the oversight of the assessment of seven major military facilities undergoing base closure. He led numerous enforcement actions under provisions of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and directed efforts to improve hydrogeologic characterization and water quality monitoring. For the past 15 years, as a founding partner with SWAPE, Matt has developed extensive client relationships and has managed complex projects that include consultation as an expert witness and a regulatory specialist, and a manager of projects ranging from industrial stormwater compliance to CEQA review of impacts from hazardous waste, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Positions Matt has held include:

- Founding Partner, Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE) (2003 – present);
- Geology Instructor, Golden West College, 2010 – 2014, 2017;
- Senior Environmental Analyst, Komex H2O Science, Inc. (2000 -- 2003);

- Executive Director, Orange Coast Watch (2001 – 2004);
- Senior Science Policy Advisor and Hydrogeologist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (1989–1998);
- Hydrogeologist, National Park Service, Water Resources Division (1998 – 2000);
- Adjunct Faculty Member, San Francisco State University, Department of Geosciences (1993 – 1998);
- Instructor, College of Marin, Department of Science (1990 – 1995);
- Geologist, U.S. Forest Service (1986 – 1998); and
- Geologist, Dames & Moore (1984 – 1986).

Senior Regulatory and Litigation Support Analyst:

With SWAPE, Matt’s responsibilities have included:

- Lead analyst and testifying expert in the review of over 300 environmental impact reports and negative declarations since 2003 under CEQA that identify significant issues with regard to hazardous waste, water resources, water quality, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and geologic hazards. Make recommendations for additional mitigation measures to lead agencies at the local and county level to include additional characterization of health risks and implementation of protective measures to reduce worker exposure to hazards from toxins and Valley Fever.
- Stormwater analysis, sampling and best management practice evaluation at more than 100 industrial facilities.
- Expert witness on numerous cases including, for example, perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) contamination of groundwater, MTBE litigation, air toxins at hazards at a school, CERCLA compliance in assessment and remediation, and industrial stormwater contamination.
- Technical assistance and litigation support for vapor intrusion concerns.
- Lead analyst and testifying expert in the review of environmental issues in license applications for large solar power plants before the California Energy Commission.
- Manager of a project to evaluate numerous formerly used military sites in the western U.S.
- Manager of a comprehensive evaluation of potential sources of perchlorate contamination in Southern California drinking water wells.
- Manager and designated expert for litigation support under provisions of Proposition 65 in the review of releases of gasoline to sources drinking water at major refineries and hundreds of gas stations throughout California.

With Komex H2O Science Inc., Matt’s duties included the following:

- Senior author of a report on the extent of perchlorate contamination that was used in testimony by the former U.S. EPA Administrator and General Counsel.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of MTBE use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in the development of a comprehensive, electronically interactive chronology of perchlorate use, research, and regulation.
- Senior researcher in a study that estimates nationwide costs for MTBE remediation and drinking water treatment, results of which were published in newspapers nationwide and in testimony against provisions of an energy bill that would limit liability for oil companies.
- Research to support litigation to restore drinking water supplies that have been contaminated by MTBE in California and New York.

- Expert witness testimony in a case of oil production-related contamination in Mississippi.
- Lead author for a multi-volume remedial investigation report for an operating school in Los Angeles that met strict regulatory requirements and rigorous deadlines.
- Development of strategic approaches for cleanup of contaminated sites in consultation with clients and regulators.

Executive Director:

As Executive Director with Orange Coast Watch, Matt led efforts to restore water quality at Orange County beaches from multiple sources of contamination including urban runoff and the discharge of wastewater. In reporting to a Board of Directors that included representatives from leading Orange County universities and businesses, Matt prepared issue papers in the areas of treatment and disinfection of wastewater and control of the discharge of grease to sewer systems. Matt actively participated in the development of countywide water quality permits for the control of urban runoff and permits for the discharge of wastewater. Matt worked with other nonprofits to protect and restore water quality, including Surfrider, Natural Resources Defense Council and Orange County CoastKeeper as well as with business institutions including the Orange County Business Council.

Hydrogeology:

As a Senior Hydrogeologist with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Matt led investigations to characterize and cleanup closing military bases, including Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, Treasure Island Naval Station, Alameda Naval Station, Moffett Field, Mather Army Airfield, and Sacramento Army Depot. Specific activities were as follows:

- Led efforts to model groundwater flow and contaminant transport, ensured adequacy of monitoring networks, and assessed cleanup alternatives for contaminated sediment, soil, and groundwater.
- Initiated a regional program for evaluation of groundwater sampling practices and laboratory analysis at military bases.
- Identified emerging issues, wrote technical guidance, and assisted in policy and regulation development through work on four national U.S. EPA workgroups, including the Superfund Groundwater Technical Forum and the Federal Facilities Forum.

At the request of the State of Hawaii, Matt developed a methodology to determine the vulnerability of groundwater to contamination on the islands of Maui and Oahu. He used analytical models and a GIS to show zones of vulnerability, and the results were adopted and published by the State of Hawaii and County of Maui.

As a hydrogeologist with the EPA Groundwater Protection Section, Matt worked with provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act and NEPA to prevent drinking water contamination. Specific activities included the following:

- Received an EPA Bronze Medal for his contribution to the development of national guidance for the protection of drinking water.
- Managed the Sole Source Aquifer Program and protected the drinking water of two communities through designation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. He prepared geologic reports, conducted

public hearings, and responded to public comments from residents who were very concerned about the impact of designation.

- Reviewed a number of Environmental Impact Statements for planned major developments, including large hazardous and solid waste disposal facilities, mine reclamation, and water transfer.

Matt served as a hydrogeologist with the RCRA Hazardous Waste program. Duties were as follows:

- Supervised the hydrogeologic investigation of hazardous waste sites to determine compliance with Subtitle C requirements.
- Reviewed and wrote "part B" permits for the disposal of hazardous waste.
- Conducted RCRA Corrective Action investigations of waste sites and led inspections that formed the basis for significant enforcement actions that were developed in close coordination with U.S. EPA legal counsel.
- Wrote contract specifications and supervised contractor's investigations of waste sites.

With the National Park Service, Matt directed service-wide investigations of contaminant sources to prevent degradation of water quality, including the following tasks:

- Applied pertinent laws and regulations including CERCLA, RCRA, NEPA, NRDA, and the Clean Water Act to control military, mining, and landfill contaminants.
- Conducted watershed-scale investigations of contaminants at parks, including Yellowstone and Olympic National Park.
- Identified high-levels of perchlorate in soil adjacent to a national park in New Mexico and advised park superintendent on appropriate response actions under CERCLA.
- Served as a Park Service representative on the Interagency Perchlorate Steering Committee, a national workgroup.
- Developed a program to conduct environmental compliance audits of all National Parks while serving on a national workgroup.
- Co-authored two papers on the potential for water contamination from the operation of personal watercraft and snowmobiles, these papers serving as the basis for the development of nationwide policy on the use of these vehicles in National Parks.
- Contributed to the Federal Multi-Agency Source Water Agreement under the Clean Water Action Plan.

Policy:

Served senior management as the Senior Science Policy Advisor with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9.

Activities included the following:

- Advised the Regional Administrator and senior management on emerging issues such as the potential for the gasoline additive MTBE and ammonium perchlorate to contaminate drinking water supplies.
- Shaped EPA's national response to these threats by serving on workgroups and by contributing to guidance, including the Office of Research and Development publication, *Oxygenates in Water: Critical Information and Research Needs*.
- Improved the technical training of EPA's scientific and engineering staff.
- Earned an EPA Bronze Medal for representing the region's 300 scientists and engineers in negotiations with the Administrator and senior management to better integrate scientific

principles into the policy-making process.

- Established national protocol for the peer review of scientific documents.

Geology:

With the U.S. Forest Service, Matt led investigations to determine hillslope stability of areas proposed for timber harvest in the central Oregon Coast Range. Specific activities were as follows:

- Mapped geology in the field, and used aerial photographic interpretation and mathematical models to determine slope stability.
- Coordinated his research with community members who were concerned with natural resource protection.
- Characterized the geology of an aquifer that serves as the sole source of drinking water for the city of Medford, Oregon.

As a consultant with Dames and Moore, Matt led geologic investigations of two contaminated sites (later listed on the Superfund NPL) in the Portland, Oregon, area and a large hazardous waste site in eastern Oregon. Duties included the following:

- Supervised year-long effort for soil and groundwater sampling.
- Conducted aquifer tests.
- Investigated active faults beneath sites proposed for hazardous waste disposal.

Teaching:

From 1990 to 1998, Matt taught at least one course per semester at the community college and university levels:

- At San Francisco State University, held an adjunct faculty position and taught courses in environmental geology, oceanography (lab and lecture), hydrogeology, and groundwater contamination.
- Served as a committee member for graduate and undergraduate students.
- Taught courses in environmental geology and oceanography at the College of Marin.

Matt is currently a part time geology instructor at Golden West College in Huntington Beach, California where he taught from 2010 to 2014 and in 2017.

Invited Testimony, Reports, Papers and Presentations:

Hagemann, M.F., 2008. Disclosure of Hazardous Waste Issues under CEQA. Presentation to the Public Environmental Law Conference, Eugene, Oregon.

Hagemann, M.F., 2008. Disclosure of Hazardous Waste Issues under CEQA. Invited presentation to U.S. EPA Region 9, San Francisco, California.

Hagemann, M.F., 2005. Use of Electronic Databases in Environmental Regulation, Policy Making and Public Participation. Brownfields 2005, Denver, Colorado.

Hagemann, M.F., 2004. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Water in Nevada and the Southwestern U.S. Presentation to a meeting of the American Groundwater Trust, Las Vegas, NV (served on conference organizing committee).

Hagemann, M.F., 2004. Invited testimony to a California Senate committee hearing on air toxins at schools in Southern California, Los Angeles.

Brown, A., Farrow, J., Gray, A. and **Hagemann, M.**, 2004. An Estimate of Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Underground Storage Tanks and the Resulting Impact to Drinking Water Wells. Presentation to the Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference, National Groundwater Association.

Hagemann, M.F., 2004. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Water in Arizona and the Southwestern U.S. Presentation to a meeting of the American Groundwater Trust, Phoenix, AZ (served on conference organizing committee).

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River and Impacts to Drinking Water in the Southwestern U.S. Invited presentation to a special committee meeting of the National Academy of Sciences, Irvine, CA.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Invited presentation to a tribal EPA meeting, Pechanga, CA.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Invited presentation to a meeting of tribal representatives, Parker, AZ.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Impact of Perchlorate on the Colorado River and Associated Drinking Water Supplies. Invited presentation to the Inter-Tribal Meeting, Torres Martinez Tribe.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. The Emergence of Perchlorate as a Widespread Drinking Water Contaminant. Invited presentation to the U.S. EPA Region 9.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. A Deductive Approach to the Assessment of Perchlorate Contamination. Invited presentation to the California Assembly Natural Resources Committee.

Hagemann, M.F., 2003. Perchlorate: A Cold War Legacy in Drinking Water. Presentation to a meeting of the National Groundwater Association.

Hagemann, M.F., 2002. From Tank to Tap: A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater. Presentation to a meeting of the National Groundwater Association.

Hagemann, M.F., 2002. A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater and an Estimate of Costs to Address Impacts to Groundwater. Presentation to the annual meeting of the Society of Environmental Journalists.

Hagemann, M.F., 2002. An Estimate of the Cost to Address MTBE Contamination in Groundwater (and Who Will Pay). Presentation to a meeting of the National Groundwater Association.

Hagemann, M.F., 2002. An Estimate of Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Underground Storage Tanks and the Resulting Impact to Drinking Water Wells. Presentation to a meeting of the U.S. EPA and State Underground Storage Tank Program managers.

Hagemann, M.F., 2001. From Tank to Tap: A Chronology of MTBE in Groundwater. Unpublished report.

Hagemann, M.F., 2001. Estimated Cleanup Cost for MTBE in Groundwater Used as Drinking Water. Unpublished report.

Hagemann, M.F., 2001. Estimated Costs to Address MTBE Releases from Leaking Underground Storage Tanks. Unpublished report.

Hagemann, M.F., and VanMouwerik, M., 1999. Potential Water Quality Concerns Related to Snowmobile Usage. Water Resources Division, National Park Service, Technical Report.

VanMouwerik, M. and **Hagemann, M.F.** 1999, Water Quality Concerns Related to Personal Watercraft Usage. Water Resources Division, National Park Service, Technical Report.

Hagemann, M.F., 1999, Is Dilution the Solution to Pollution in National Parks? The George Wright Society Biannual Meeting, Asheville, North Carolina.

Hagemann, M.F., 1997, The Potential for MTBE to Contaminate Groundwater. U.S. EPA Superfund Groundwater Technical Forum Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Hagemann, M.F., and Gill, M., 1996, Impediments to Intrinsic Remediation, Moffett Field Naval Air Station, Conference on Intrinsic Remediation of Chlorinated Hydrocarbons, Salt Lake City.

Hagemann, M.F., Fukunaga, G.L., 1996, The Vulnerability of Groundwater to Anthropogenic Contaminants on the Island of Maui, Hawaii. Hawaii Water Works Association Annual Meeting, Maui, October 1996.

Hagemann, M. F., Fukunaga, G. L., 1996, Ranking Groundwater Vulnerability in Central Oahu, Hawaii. Proceedings, Geographic Information Systems in Environmental Resources Management, Air and Waste Management Association Publication VIP-61.

Hagemann, M.F., 1994. Groundwater Characterization and Clean up at Closing Military Bases in California. Proceedings, California Groundwater Resources Association Meeting.

Hagemann, M.F. and Sabol, M.A., 1993. Role of the U.S. EPA in the High Plains States Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Program. Proceedings, Sixth Biennial Symposium on the Artificial Recharge of Groundwater.

Hagemann, M.F., 1993. U.S. EPA Policy on the Technical Impracticability of the Cleanup of DNAPL-contaminated Groundwater. California Groundwater Resources Association Meeting.

Hagemann, M.F., 1992. Dense Nonaqueous Phase Liquid Contamination of Groundwater: An Ounce of Prevention... Proceedings, Association of Engineering Geologists Annual Meeting, v. 35.

Other Experience:

Selected as subject matter expert for the California Professional Geologist licensing examinations, 2009-2011.



Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and
Litigation Support for the Environment

SOIL WATER AIR PROTECTION ENTERPRISE
2656 29th Street, Suite 201
Santa Monica, California 90405
Attn: Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.
Mobil: (310) 795-2335
Office: (310) 452-5555
Fax: (310) 452-5550
Email: prosenfeld@swape.com

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

Principal Environmental Chemist

Chemical Fate and Transport & Air Dispersion Modeling

Risk Assessment & Remediation Specialist

Education

Ph.D. Soil Chemistry, University of Washington, 1999. Dissertation on volatile organic compound filtration.

M.S. Environmental Science, U.C. Berkeley, 1995. Thesis on organic waste economics.

B.A. Environmental Studies, U.C. Santa Barbara, 1991. Focus on wastewater treatment.

Professional Experience

Dr. Rosenfeld has over 25 years of experience conducting environmental investigations and risk assessments for evaluating impacts to human health, property, and ecological receptors. His expertise focuses on the fate and transport of environmental contaminants, human health risk, exposure assessment, and ecological restoration. Dr. Rosenfeld has evaluated and modeled emissions from oil spills, landfills, boilers and incinerators, process stacks, storage tanks, confined animal feeding operations, industrial, military and agricultural sources, unconventional oil drilling operations, and locomotive and construction engines. His project experience ranges from monitoring and modeling of pollution sources to evaluating impacts of pollution on workers at industrial facilities and residents in surrounding communities. Dr. Rosenfeld has also successfully modeled exposure to contaminants distributed by water systems and via vapor intrusion.

Dr. Rosenfeld has investigated and designed remediation programs and risk assessments for contaminated sites containing lead, heavy metals, mold, bacteria, particulate matter, petroleum hydrocarbons, chlorinated solvents, pesticides, radioactive waste, dioxins and furans, semi- and volatile organic compounds, PCBs, PAHs, creosote, perchlorate, asbestos, per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFOA/PFOS), unusual polymers, fuel oxygenates (MTBE), among other pollutants. Dr. Rosenfeld also has experience evaluating greenhouse gas emissions from various projects and is an expert on the assessment of odors from industrial and agricultural sites, as well as the evaluation of odor nuisance impacts and technologies for abatement of odorous emissions. As a principal scientist at SWAPE, Dr. Rosenfeld directs air dispersion modeling and exposure assessments. He has served as an expert witness and testified about pollution sources causing nuisance and/or personal injury at sites and has testified as an expert witness on numerous cases involving exposure to soil, water and air contaminants from industrial, railroad, agricultural, and military sources.

Professional History:

Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE); 2003 to present; Principal and Founding Partner
UCLA School of Public Health; 2007 to 2011; Lecturer (Assistant Researcher)
UCLA School of Public Health; 2003 to 2006; Adjunct Professor
UCLA Environmental Science and Engineering Program; 2002-2004; Doctoral Intern Coordinator
UCLA Institute of the Environment, 2001-2002; Research Associate
Komex H₂O Science, 2001 to 2003; Senior Remediation Scientist
National Groundwater Association, 2002-2004; Lecturer
San Diego State University, 1999-2001; Adjunct Professor
Anteon Corp., San Diego, 2000-2001; Remediation Project Manager
Ogden (now Amec), San Diego, 2000-2000; Remediation Project Manager
Bechtel, San Diego, California, 1999 – 2000; Risk Assessor
King County, Seattle, 1996 – 1999; Scientist
James River Corp., Washington, 1995-96; Scientist
Big Creek Lumber, Davenport, California, 1995; Scientist
Plumas Corp., California and USFS, Tahoe 1993-1995; Scientist
Peace Corps and World Wildlife Fund, St. Kitts, West Indies, 1991-1993; Scientist

Publications:

Rosenfeld P. E., Spaeth K., Hallman R., Bressler R., Smith, G., (2022) Cancer Risk and Diesel Exhaust Exposure Among Railroad Workers. *Water Air Soil Pollution*. **233**, 171.

Remy, L.L., Clay T., Byers, V., **Rosenfeld P. E.** (2019) Hospital, Health, and Community Burden After Oil Refinery Fires, Richmond, California 2007 and 2012. *Environmental Health*. 18:48

Simons, R.A., Seo, Y. **Rosenfeld, P.**, (2015) Modeling the Effect of Refinery Emission On Residential Property Value. *Journal of Real Estate Research*. 27(3):321-342

Chen, J. A, Zapata A. R., Sutherland A. J., Molmen, D.R., Chow, B. S., Wu, L. E., **Rosenfeld, P. E.**, Hesse, R. C., (2012) Sulfur Dioxide and Volatile Organic Compound Exposure To A Community In Texas City Texas Evaluated Using Aermol and Empirical Data. *American Journal of Environmental Science*, 8(6), 622-632.

Rosenfeld, P.E. & Feng, L. (2011). *The Risks of Hazardous Waste*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2011). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Agrochemical Industry*, Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Gonzalez, J., Feng, L., Sutherland, A., Waller, C., Sok, H., Hesse, R., **Rosenfeld, P.** (2010). PCBs and Dioxins/Furans in Attic Dust Collected Near Former PCB Production and Secondary Copper Facilities in Sauget, IL. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*. 113–125.

Feng, L., Wu, C., Tam, L., Sutherland, A.J., Clark, J.J., **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2010). Dioxin and Furan Blood Lipid and Attic Dust Concentrations in Populations Living Near Four Wood Treatment Facilities in the United States. *Journal of Environmental Health*. 73(6), 34-46.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2010). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Wood and Paper Industries*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2009). *Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Petroleum Industry*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., **Rosenfeld, P.** (2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. *WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment, Air Pollution*, 123 (17), 319-327.

Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2008). A Statistical Analysis Of Attic Dust And Blood Lipid Concentrations Of Tetrachloro-p-Dibenzodioxin (TCDD) Toxicity Equivalency Quotients (TEQ) In Two Populations Near Wood Treatment Facilities. *Organohalogen Compounds*, 70, 002252-002255.

Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2008). Methods For Collect Samples For Assessing Dioxins And Other Environmental Contaminants In Attic Dust: A Review. *Organohalogen Compounds*, 70, 000527-000530.

Hensley, A.R. A. Scott, J. J. J. Clark, **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2007). Attic Dust and Human Blood Samples Collected near a Former Wood Treatment Facility. *Environmental Research*. 105, 194-197.

Rosenfeld, P.E., J. J. J. Clark, A. R. Hensley, M. Suffet. (2007). The Use of an Odor Wheel Classification for Evaluation of Human Health Risk Criteria for Compost Facilities. *Water Science & Technology* 55(5), 345-357.

Rosenfeld, P. E., M. Suffet. (2007). The Anatomy Of Odour Wheels For Odours Of Drinking Water, Wastewater, Compost And The Urban Environment. *Water Science & Technology* 55(5), 335-344.

Sullivan, P. J. Clark, J.J.J., Agardy, F. J., **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2007). *Toxic Legacy, Synthetic Toxins in the Food, Water, and Air in American Cities*. Boston Massachusetts: Elsevier Publishing

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash. *Water Science and Technology*. 49(9),171-178.

Rosenfeld P. E., J.J. Clark, I.H. (Mel) Suffet (2004). The Value of An Odor-Quality-Wheel Classification Scheme For The Urban Environment. *Water Environment Federation's Technical Exhibition and Conference (WEFTEC) 2004*. New Orleans, October 2-6, 2004.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Suffet, I.H. (2004). Understanding Odorants Associated With Compost, Biomass Facilities, and the Land Application of Biosolids. *Water Science and Technology*. 49(9), 193-199.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash, *Water Science and Technology*, 49(9), 171-178.

Rosenfeld, P. E., Grey, M. A., Sellew, P. (2004). Measurement of Biosolids Odor and Odorant Emissions from Windrows, Static Pile and Biofilter. *Water Environment Research*. 76(4), 310-315.

Rosenfeld, P.E., Grey, M and Suffet, M. (2002). Compost Demonstration Project, Sacramento California Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. *Integrated Waste Management Board Public Affairs Office, Publications Clearinghouse (MS-6)*, Sacramento, CA Publication #442-02-008.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and C.L. Henry. (2001). Characterization of odor emissions from three different biosolids. *Water Soil and Air Pollution*. 127(1-4), 173-191.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Henry C. L., (2000). Wood ash control of odor emissions from biosolids application. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 29, 1662-1668.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry and D. Bennett. (2001). Wastewater dewatering polymer affect on biosolids odor emissions and microbial activity. *Water Environment Research*. 73(4), 363-367.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and C.L. Henry. (2001). Activated Carbon and Wood Ash Sorption of Wastewater, Compost, and Biosolids Odorants. *Water Environment Research*, 73, 388-393.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Henry C. L., (2001). High carbon wood ash effect on biosolids microbial activity and odor. *Water Environment Research*. 131(1-4), 247-262.

Chollack, T. and **P. Rosenfeld**. (1998). Compost Amendment Handbook For Landscaping. Prepared for and distributed by the City of Redmond, Washington State.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1992). The Mount Liamuiga Crater Trail. *Heritage Magazine of St. Kitts*, 3(2).

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1993). High School Biogas Project to Prevent Deforestation On St. Kitts. *Biomass Users Network*, 7(1).

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions From Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. Doctoral Thesis. University of Washington College of Forest Resources.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1994). Potential Utilization of Small Diameter Trees on Sierra County Public Land. Masters thesis reprinted by the Sierra County Economic Council. Sierra County, California.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1991). How to Build a Small Rural Anaerobic Digester & Uses Of Biogas In The First And Third World. Bachelors Thesis. University of California.

Presentations:

Rosenfeld, P.E., "The science for Perfluorinated Chemicals (PFAS): What makes remediation so hard?" Law Seminars International, (May 9-10, 2018) 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 101 Seattle, WA.

Rosenfeld, P.E., Sutherland, A; Hesse, R.; Zapata, A. (October 3-6, 2013). Air dispersion modeling of volatile organic emissions from multiple natural gas wells in Decatur, TX. *44th Western Regional Meeting, American Chemical Society*. Lecture conducted from Santa Clara, CA.

Sok, H.L.; Waller, C.C.; Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sutherland, A.J.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; Hesse, R.C.; **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (June 20-23, 2010). Atrazine: A Persistent Pesticide in Urban Drinking Water. *Urban Environmental Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sok, H.L.; Sutherland, A.J.; Waller, C.C.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; La, M.; Hesse, R.C.; **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (June 20-23, 2010). Bringing Environmental Justice to East St. Louis, Illinois. *Urban Environmental Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

Rosenfeld, P.E. (April 19-23, 2009). Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) and Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS) Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. *2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting*, Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

Rosenfeld, P.E. (April 19-23, 2009). Cost to Filter Atrazine Contamination from Drinking Water in the United States" Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. *2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting*. Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., **Rosenfeld, P.** (20-22 July, 2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. Brebbia, C.A. and Popov, V., eds., *Air Pollution XVII: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Modeling, Monitoring and Management of Air Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Tallinn, Estonia.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (October 15-18, 2007). Moss Point Community Exposure To Contaminants From A Releasing Facility. *The 23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water*. Platform lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (October 15-18, 2007). The Repeated Trespass of Tritium-Contaminated Water Into A Surrounding Community Form Repeated Waste Spills From A Nuclear Power Plant. *The 23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water*. Platform lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (October 15-18, 2007). Somerville Community Exposure To Contaminants From Wood Treatment Facility Emissions. *The 23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water*. Lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

Rosenfeld P. E. (March 2007). Production, Chemical Properties, Toxicology, & Treatment Case Studies of 1,2,3-Trichloropropane (TCP). *The Association for Environmental Health and Sciences (AEHS) Annual Meeting*. Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

Rosenfeld P. E. (March 2007). Blood and Attic Sampling for Dioxin/Furan, PAH, and Metal Exposure in Florida, Alabama. *The AEHS Annual Meeting*. Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., **Rosenfeld P.E.**, Clark, J.J.J. (August 21 – 25, 2006). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. *The 26th International Symposium on Halogenated Persistent Organic Pollutants – DIOXIN2006*. Lecture conducted from Radisson SAS Scandinavia Hotel in Oslo Norway.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., **Rosenfeld P.E.**, Clark, J.J.J. (November 4-8, 2006). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. *APHA 134 Annual Meeting & Exposition*. Lecture conducted from Boston Massachusetts.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (October 24-25, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. Mealey's C8/PFOA. *Science, Risk & Litigation Conference*. Lecture conducted from The Rittenhouse Hotel, Philadelphia, PA.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (September 19, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, *Toxicology and Remediation PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference*. Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel, Irvine California.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (September 19, 2005). Fate, Transport, Toxicity, And Persistence of 1,2,3-TCP. *PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference*. Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel in Irvine, California.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (September 26-27, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PDBEs. *Mealey's Groundwater Conference*. Lecture conducted from Ritz Carlton Hotel, Marina Del Ray, California.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (June 7-8, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. *International Society of Environmental Forensics: Focus On Emerging Contaminants*. Lecture conducted from Sheraton Oceanfront Hotel, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (July 21-22, 2005). Fate Transport, Persistence and Toxicology of PFOA and Related Perfluorochemicals. *2005 National Groundwater Association Ground Water And Environmental Law Conference*. Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. (July 21-22, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, Toxicology and Remediation. *2005 National Groundwater Association Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference*. Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. and James Clark Ph.D. and Rob Hesse R.G. (May 5-6, 2004). Tert-butyl Alcohol Liability and Toxicology, A National Problem and Unquantified Liability. *National Groundwater Association. Environmental Law Conference*. Lecture conducted from Congress Plaza Hotel, Chicago Illinois.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. (March 2004). Perchlorate Toxicology. *Meeting of the American Groundwater Trust*. Lecture conducted from Phoenix Arizona.

Hagemann, M.F., **Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and Rob Hesse (2004). Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. *Meeting of tribal representatives*. Lecture conducted from Parker, AZ.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. (April 7, 2004). A National Damage Assessment Model For PCE and Dry Cleaners. *Drycleaner Symposium. California Ground Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Radison Hotel, Sacramento, California.

Rosenfeld, P. E., Grey, M., (June 2003) Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. *Seventh International In Situ And On Site Bioremediation Symposium Battelle Conference Orlando, FL*.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. and James Clark Ph.D. (February 20-21, 2003) Understanding Historical Use, Chemical Properties, Toxicity and Regulatory Guidance of 1,4 Dioxane. *National Groundwater Association. Southwest Focus Conference. Water Supply and Emerging Contaminants..* Lecture conducted from Hyatt Regency Phoenix Arizona.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. (February 6-7, 2003). Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. *California CUPA Forum*. Lecture conducted from Marriott Hotel, Anaheim California.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. (October 23, 2002) Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. *EPA Underground Storage Tank Roundtable*. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

Rosenfeld, P.E. and Suffet, M. (October 7- 10, 2002). Understanding Odor from Compost, *Wastewater and Industrial Processes. Sixth Annual Symposium On Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

Rosenfeld, P.E. and Suffet, M. (October 7- 10, 2002). Using High Carbon Wood Ash to Control Compost Odor. *Sixth Annual Symposium On Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

Rosenfeld, P.E. and Grey, M. A. (September 22-24, 2002). Biocycle Composting For Coastal Sage Restoration. *Northwest Biosolids Management Association*. Lecture conducted from Vancouver Washington..

Rosenfeld, P.E. and Grey, M. A. (November 11-14, 2002). Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. *Soil Science Society Annual Conference*. Lecture conducted from Indianapolis, Maryland.

Rosenfeld, P.E. (September 16, 2000). Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. *Water Environment Federation*. Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

Rosenfeld, P.E. (October 16, 2000). Wood ash and biofilter control of compost odor. *Biofest*. Lecture conducted from Ocean Shores, California.

Rosenfeld, P.E. (2000). Bioremediation Using Organic Soil Amendments. *California Resource Recovery Association*. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation With High-Carbon Wood-Ash. *Water Environment Federation 12th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings*. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and C.L. Henry. (1999). An evaluation of ash incorporation with biosolids for odor reduction. *Soil Science Society of America*. Lecture conducted from Salt Lake City Utah.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Comparison of Microbial Activity and Odor Emissions from Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. *Brown and Caldwell*. Lecture conducted from Seattle Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry. (1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions from Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. *Biofest*. Lecture conducted from Lake Chelan, Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation With High-Carbon Wood-Ash. Water Environment Federation 12th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry, R. B. Harrison, and R. Dills. (1997). Comparison of Odor Emissions From Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. *Soil Science Society of America*. Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

Teaching Experience:

UCLA Department of Environmental Health (Summer 2003 through 20010) Taught Environmental Health Science 100 to students, including undergrad, medical doctors, public health professionals and nurses. Course focused on the health effects of environmental contaminants.

National Ground Water Association, Successful Remediation Technologies. Custom Course in Sante Fe, New Mexico. May 21, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of fuel contaminants associated with underground storage tanks.

National Ground Water Association; Successful Remediation Technologies Course in Chicago Illinois. April 1, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of contaminants associated with Superfund and RCRA sites.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, April and May, 2001. Alternative Landfill Caps Seminar in San Diego, Ventura, and San Francisco. Focused on both prescriptive and innovative landfill cover design.

UCLA Department of Environmental Engineering, February 5, 2002. Seminar on Successful Remediation Technologies focusing on Groundwater Remediation.

University Of Washington, Soil Science Program, Teaching Assistant for several courses including: Soil Chemistry, Organic Soil Amendments, and Soil Stability.

U.C. Berkeley, Environmental Science Program Teaching Assistant for Environmental Science 10.

Academic Grants Awarded:

California Integrated Waste Management Board. \$41,000 grant awarded to UCLA Institute of the Environment. Goal: To investigate effect of high carbon wood ash on volatile organic emissions from compost. 2001.

Synagro Technologies, Corona California: \$10,000 grant awarded to San Diego State University. Goal: investigate effect of biosolids for restoration and remediation of degraded coastal sage soils. 2000.

King County, Department of Research and Technology, Washington State. \$100,000 grant awarded to University of Washington: Goal: To investigate odor emissions from biosolids application and the effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions. 1998.

Northwest Biosolids Management Association, Washington State. \$20,000 grant awarded to investigate effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions from biosolids. 1997.

James River Corporation, Oregon: \$10,000 grant was awarded to investigate the success of genetically engineered Poplar trees with resistance to round-up. 1996.

United State Forest Service, Tahoe National Forest: \$15,000 grant was awarded to investigating fire ecology of the Tahoe National Forest. 1995.

Kellogg Foundation, Washington D.C. \$500 grant was awarded to construct a large anaerobic digester on St. Kitts in West Indies. 1993

Deposition and/or Trial Testimony:

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino
Billy Wildrick, Plaintiff vs. BNSF Railway Company
Case No. CIVDS1711810
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-17-2022

In the State Court of Bibb County, State of Georgia
Richard Hutcherson, Plaintiff vs Norfolk Southern Railway Company
Case No. 10-SCCV-092007
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-6-2022

In the Civil District Court of the Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana
Millard Clark, Plaintiff vs. Dixie Carriers, Inc. et al.
Case No. 2020-03891
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-15-2022

In The Circuit Court of Livingston County, State of Missouri, Circuit Civil Division
Shirley Ralls, Plaintiff vs. Canadian Pacific Railway and Soo Line Railroad
Case No. 18-LV-CC0020
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-7-2022

In The Circuit Court of the 13th Judicial Circuit Court, Hillsborough County, Florida Civil Division
Jonny C. Daniels, Plaintiff vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No. 20-CA-5502
Rosenfeld Deposition 9-1-2022

In The Circuit Court of St. Louis County, State of Missouri
Kieth Luke et. al. Plaintiff vs. Monsanto Company et. al.
Case No. 19SL-CC03191
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-25-2022

In The Circuit Court of the 13th Judicial Circuit Court, Hillsborough County, Florida Civil Division
Jeffery S. Lamotte, Plaintiff vs. CSX Transportation Inc.
Case No. NO. 20-CA-0049
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-22-2022

In State of Minnesota District Court, County of St. Louis Sixth Judicial District
Greg Bean, Plaintiff vs. Soo Line Railroad Company
Case No. 69-DU-CV-21-760
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-17-2022

In United States District Court Western District of Washington at Tacoma, Washington
John D. Fitzgerald Plaintiff vs. BNSF
Case No. 3:21-cv-05288-RJB
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-11-2022

In Circuit Court of the Sixth Judicial Circuit, Macon Illinois
Rocky Bennyhoff Plaintiff vs. Norfolk Southern
Case No. 20-L-56
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-3-2022

In Court of Common Pleas, Hamilton County Ohio
Joe Briggins Plaintiff vs. CSX
Case No. A2004464
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-17-2022

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern
George LaFazia vs. BNSF Railway Company.
Case No. BCV-19-103087
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-17-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Bobby Earles vs. Penn Central et. al.
Case No. 2020-L-000550
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-16-2022

In United States District Court Easter District of Florida
Albert Hartman Plaintiff vs. Illinois Central
Case No. 2:20-cv-1633
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-4-2022

In the Circuit Court of the 4th Judicial Circuit, in and For Duval County, Florida
Barbara Steele vs. CSX Transportation
Case No.16-219-Ca-008796
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-15-2022

In United States District Court Easter District of New York
Romano et al. vs. Northrup Grumman Corporation
Case No. 16-cv-5760
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-10-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Linda Benjamin vs. Illinois Central
Case No. No. 2019 L 007599
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-26-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Donald Smith vs. Illinois Central
Case No. No. 2019 L 003426
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-24-2022

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Jan Holeman vs. BNSF
Case No. 2019 L 000675
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-18-2022

In the State Court of Bibb County State of Georgia
Dwayne B. Garrett vs. Norfolk Southern
Case No. 20-SCCV-091232
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-10-2021

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Joseph Ruepke vs. BNSF
Case No. 2019 L 007730
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-5-2021

In the United States District Court For the District of Nebraska
Steven Gillett vs. BNSF
Case No. 4:20-cv-03120
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-28-2021

In the Montana Thirteenth District Court of Yellowstone County
James Eadus vs. Soo Line Railroad and BNSF
Case No. DV 19-1056
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-21-2021

In the Circuit Court Of The Twentieth Judicial Circuit, St Clair County, Illinois
Martha Custer et al.cvs. Cerro Flow Products, Inc.
Case No. 0i9-L-2295
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-14-2021
Trial October 8-4-2021

In the Circuit Court of Cook County Illinois
Joseph Rafferty vs. Consolidated Rail Corporation and National Railroad Passenger Corporation d/b/a
AMTRAK,
Case No. 18-L-6845
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-28-2021

In the United States District Court For the Northern District of Illinois
Theresa Romcoe vs. Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Railroad Corporation d/b/a METRA Rail
Case No. 17-cv-8517
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-25-2021

In the Superior Court of the State of Arizona In and For the Cunty of Maricopa
Mary Tryon et al. vs. The City of Pheonix v. Cox Cactus Farm, L.L.C., Utah Shelter Systems, Inc.
Case No. CV20127-094749
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-7-2021

In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas Beaumont Division
Robinson, Jeremy et al vs. CNA Insurance Company et al.
Case No. 1:17-cv-000508
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-25-2021

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino
Gary Garner, Personal Representative for the Estate of Melvin Garner vs. BNSF Railway Company.
Case No. 1720288
Rosenfeld Deposition 2-23-2021

In the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, Spring Street Courthouse
Benny M Rodriguez vs. Union Pacific Railroad, A Corporation, et al.
Case No. 18STCV01162
Rosenfeld Deposition 12-23-2020

In the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri
Karen Cornwell, Plaintiff, vs. Marathon Petroleum, LP, Defendant.
Case No. 1716-CV10006
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-30-2019

In the United States District Court For The District of New Jersey
Duarte et al, Plaintiffs, vs. United States Metals Refining Company et. al. Defendant.
Case No. 2:17-cv-01624-ES-SCM
Rosenfeld Deposition 6-7-2019

In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division
M/T Carla Maersk vs. Conti 168., Schiffahrts-GMBH & Co. Bulker KG MS “Conti Perdido” Defendant.
Case No. 3:15-CV-00106 consolidated with 3:15-CV-00237
Rosenfeld Deposition 5-9-2019

In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles – Santa Monica
Carole-Taddeo-Bates et al., vs. Ifran Khan et al., Defendants
Case No. BC615636
Rosenfeld Deposition 1-26-2019

In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Los Angeles – Santa Monica
The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments et al. vs El Adobe Apts. Inc. et al., Defendants
Case No. BC646857
Rosenfeld Deposition 10-6-2018; Trial 3-7-19

In United States District Court For The District of Colorado
Bells et al. Plaintiffs vs. The 3M Company et al., Defendants
Case No. 1:16-cv-02531-RBJ
Rosenfeld Deposition 3-15-2018 and 4-3-2018

In The District Court Of Regan County, Texas, 112th Judicial District
Phillip Bales et al., Plaintiff vs. Dow Agrosiences, LLC, et al., Defendants
Cause No. 1923
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-17-2017

In The Superior Court of the State of California In And For The County Of Contra Costa
Simons et al., Plaintiffs vs. Chevron Corporation, et al., Defendants
Cause No. C12-01481
Rosenfeld Deposition 11-20-2017

In The Circuit Court Of The Twentieth Judicial Circuit, St Clair County, Illinois
Martha Custer et al., Plaintiff vs. Cerro Flow Products, Inc., Defendants
Case No.: No. 0i9-L-2295
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-23-2017

In United States District Court For The Southern District of Mississippi
Guy Manuel vs. The BP Exploration et al., Defendants
Case No. 1:19-cv-00315-RHW
Rosenfeld Deposition 4-22-2020

In The Superior Court of the State of California, For The County of Los Angeles
Warrn Gilbert and Penny Gilbert, Plaintiff vs. BMW of North America LLC
Case No. LC102019 (c/w BC582154)
Rosenfeld Deposition 8-16-2017, Trail 8-28-2018

In the Northern District Court of Mississippi, Greenville Division
Brenda J. Cooper, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Meritor Inc., et al., Defendants
Case No. 4:16-cv-52-DMB-JVM
Rosenfeld Deposition July 2017

In The Superior Court of the State of Washington, County of Snohomish
Michael Davis and Julie Davis et al., Plaintiff vs. Cedar Grove Composting Inc., Defendants
Case No. 13-2-03987-5
Rosenfeld Deposition, February 2017
Trial March 2017

In The Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda
Charles Spain., Plaintiff vs. Thermo Fisher Scientific, et al., Defendants
Case No. RG14711115
Rosenfeld Deposition September 2015

In The Iowa District Court In And For Poweshiek County
Russell D. Winburn, et al., Plaintiffs vs. Doug Hoksbergen, et al., Defendants
Case No. LALA002187
Rosenfeld Deposition August 2015

In The Circuit Court of Ohio County, West Virginia
Robert Andrews, et al. v. Antero, et al.
Civil Action No. 14-C-30000
Rosenfeld Deposition June 2015

In The Iowa District Court for Muscatine County
Laurie Freeman et. al. Plaintiffs vs. Grain Processing Corporation, Defendant
Case No. 4980
Rosenfeld Deposition May 2015

In the Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit, in and For Broward County, Florida
Walter Hinton, et. al. Plaintiff, vs. City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, a Municipality, Defendant.
Case No. CACE07030358 (26)
Rosenfeld Deposition December 2014

In the County Court of Dallas County Texas
Lisa Parr et al, Plaintiff, vs. Aruba et al, Defendant.
Case No. cc-11-01650-E
Rosenfeld Deposition: March and September 2013
Rosenfeld Trial April 2014

In the Court of Common Pleas of Tuscarawas County Ohio
John Michael Abicht, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Republic Services, Inc., et al., Defendants
Case No. 2008 CT 10 0741 (Cons. w/ 2009 CV 10 0987)
Rosenfeld Deposition October 2012

In the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama, Northern Division
James K. Benefield, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. International Paper Company, Defendant.
Civil Action No. 2:09-cv-232-WHA-TFM
Rosenfeld Deposition July 2010, June 2011

In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama
Jaeonette Moss Anthony, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Drummond Company Inc., et al., Defendants
Civil Action No. CV 2008-2076
Rosenfeld Deposition September 2010

In the United States District Court, Western District Lafayette Division
Ackle et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Citgo Petroleum Corporation, et al., Defendants.
Case No. 2:07CV1052
Rosenfeld Deposition July 2009