

VIA U.S. MAIL & E-MAIL

January 21, 2020

City of Menifee Menifee City Hall, Community Development Department Attention: Manny Baeza, Senior Planner 29844 Haun Road Menifee, CA 92586 Em: mbaeza@cityofmenifee.us

> RE: <u>Menifee North Specific Plan 260, Amendment No. 3 (2010-090), SCH</u> No. 2019029123 ("Palomar Crossings")

Dear Mr. Baeza,

On behalf of the Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters (Collectively "**Commenter**" or "**Carpenters**"), my Office is submitting these comments on the County of San Diego's ("**County**" or "**Lead Agency**") Draft Environmental Impact Report ("**DEIR**" or "draft EIR") (SCH No. 2019029123) for Menifee North Specific Plan 260, Amendment No. 3 (2010-090) or "Palomar Crossings" Project ("**Project**").

The Project involves a Specific Plan Amendment to the Menifee North Specific Plan No. 260 ("SP 260, A3"). DEIR, 1-1. SP260, A3 proposes modifications to the Specific Plan Land Use Plan Planning Areas (PA) to increase the total dwelling unit count <u>by</u> <u>721 units</u>, by re-designating PA11 to Very High Density Residential and PA12 to Commercial / Very High-Density Residential. *Id*.

The Carpenters is a labor union representing 50,000 union carpenters in six states, including in southern California, and has a strong interest in well-ordered land use planning and addressing the environmental impacts of development projects.

Commenter expressly reserves the right to supplement these comments at or prior to hearings on the Project, and at any later hearings and proceedings related to this Project. Cal. Gov. Code § 65009(b); Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21177(a); *Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. Bakersfield* (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1199-1203; see *Galante Vineyards v. Monterey Water Dist.* (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 1121.

8.1

8.3

8.4

City of Menifee – Palomar Crossings January 21, 2020 Page 2 of 17

Commenter expressly reserves the right to supplement these comments at or prior to hearings on the Project, and at any later hearings and proceedings related to this Project. Cal. Gov. Code § 65009(b); Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21177(a); *Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. Bakersfield* (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1199-1203; see *Galante Vineyards v. Monterey Water Dist.* (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 1121.

Commenter incorporates by reference all comments raising issues regarding the EIR submitted prior to certification of the EIR for the Project. *Citizens for Clean Energy v City of Woodland* (2014) 225 CA4th 173, 191 (finding that any party who has objected to the Project's environmental documentation may assert any issue timely raised by other parties).

Moreover, Commenter requests that the Lead Agency provide notice for any and all notices referring or related to the Project issued under the California Environmental Quality Act ("**CEQA**"), Cal Public Resources Code ("**PRC**") § 21000 *et seq*, and the California Planning and Zoning Law ("**Planning and Zoning Law**"), Cal. Gov't Code §§ 65000–65010. California Public Resources Code Sections 21092.2, and 21167(f) and Government Code Section 65092 require agencies to mail such notices to any person who has filed a written request for them with the clerk of the agency's governing body.

I. EXPERTS

This comment letter includes comments from air quality and greenhouse gas experts Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg. and Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. concerning the DEIR. Their comments, attachments, and Curriculum Vitae ("CV") are attached hereto and are incorporated herein by reference.

Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg. ("Mr. Hagemann") has over 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, Mr. Hagemann also served as Senior Hydrogeologist in the oversight of the assessment of seven major military facilities undergoing base closer. 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. 8.5

8.6

8.7

8.8

For the past 15 years, Mr. Hagemann has worked as a founding partner with SWAPE (Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise). At SWAPE, Mr. Hagemann 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.

Mr. Hagemann has a Bachelor of Arts degree in geology from Humboldt State University in California and a Masters in Science degree from California State University Los Angeles in California.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. ("Dr. Rosenfeld") is a principal environmental chemist at SWAPE. Dr. Rosenfeld has over 25 years' experience conducting environmental investigations and risk assessments for evaluating impacts on human health, property, and ecological receptors. His expertise focuses on the fate and transport of environmental contaminants, human health risks, exposure assessment, and ecological restoration. Dr. Rosenfeld has evaluated and modeled emissions from unconventional oil drilling operations, oil spills, landfills, boilers and incinerators, process stacks, storage tanks, confined animal feeding operations, and many other industrial and agricultural sources. His project experience ranges from monitoring and modeling of pollution sources to evaluating the impacts of pollution on workers at industrial facilities and residents in surrounding communities.

Dr. Rosenfeld has investigated and designed remediation programs and risk assessments for contaminated sites containing lead, heavy metals, mold, bacteria, particular matter, petroleum hydrocarbons, chlorinated solvents, pesticides, radioactive waste, dioxins and furans, semi- and volatile organic compounds, PCBs, PAHs, 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 dozens of sites and has testified as an expert witness on more than ten cases involving exposure to air contaminants from industrial sources. 8.10

8.11

8.12

Dr. Rosenfeld has a Ph.D. in soil chemistry from the University of Washington, M.S. in environmental science from U.C. Berkeley, and a B.A. in environmental studies from U.C. Santa Barbara.

II. THE PROJECT WOULD BE APPROVED IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

A. <u>Background Concerning the California Environmental Quality Act</u>

CEQA has two basic purposes. First, CEQA is designed to inform decision-makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of a project. 14 California Code of Regulations ("**CCR**" or "**CEQA Guidelines**") § 15002(a)(1). "Its purpose is to inform the public and its responsible officials of the environmental consequences of their decisions *before* they are made. Thus, the EIR 'protects not only the environment but also informed self-government.' [Citation.]" *Citizens of Goleta V alley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553, 564. The EIR has been described as "an environmental 'alarm bell' whose purpose it is to alert the public and its responsible officials to environmental changes before they have reached ecological points of no return." Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay v. Bd. of Port Comm'rs. (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344, 1354 ("Berkeley Jets"); County of Inyo v. Yorty (1973) 32 Cal.App.3d 795, 810.

Second, CEQA directs public agencies to avoid or reduce environmental damage when possible by requiring alternatives or mitigation measures. CEQA Guidelines § 15002(a)(2) and (3). See also, Berkeley Jets, 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344, 1354; Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553; Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of the University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400. The EIR serves to provide public agencies and the public in general with information about the effect that a proposed project is likely to have on the environment and to "identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced." CEQA Guidelines § 15002(a)(2). If the project has a significant effect on the environment, the agency may approve the project only upon finding that it has "eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment are "acceptable due to overriding concerns" specified in CEQA section 21081. CEQA Guidelines § 15092(b)(2)(A–B).

While the courts review an EIR using an "abuse of discretion" standard, "the reviewing court is not to 'uncritically rely on every study or analysis presented by a

8.14

8.15

City of Menifee – Palomar Crossings January 21, 2020 Page 5 of 17

project proponent in support of its position.' A 'clearly inadequate or unsupported study is entitled to no judicial deference."" *Berkeley Jets*, 91 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1355 (emphasis added) (quoting *Laurel Heights*, 47 Cal.3d at 391, 409 fn. 12). Drawing this line and determining whether the EIR complies with CEQA's information disclosure requirements presents a question of law subject to independent review by the courts. (*Sierra Club v. Cnty. of Fresno* (2018) 6 Cal. 5th 502, 515; *Madera Oversight Coalition, Inc. v. County of Madera* (2011) 199 Cal.App.4th 48, 102, 131.) As the court stated in *Berkeley Jets*, 91 Cal. App. 4th at 1355:

A prejudicial abuse of discretion occurs "if the failure to include relevant information precludes informed decision-making and informed public participation, thereby thwarting the statutory goals of the EIR process.

The preparation and circulation of an EIR are more than a set of technical hurdles for agencies and developers to overcome. The EIR's function is to ensure that government officials who decide to build or approve a project do so with a full understanding of the environmental consequences and, equally important, that the public is assured those consequences have been considered. For the EIR to serve these goals it must present information so that the foreseeable impacts of pursuing the project can be understood and weighed, and the public must be given an adequate opportunity to comment on that presentation before the decision to go forward is made. *Communities for a Better Environment v. Richmond* (2010) 184 Cal. App. 4th 70, 80 (quoting *Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 412, 449–450).

B. <u>The DEIR Fails to Adequately Describe the Project</u>

Throughout the DEIR, it describes the Project as involving a Specific Plan
Amendment (SPA 260, A3) which would increase the total dwelling unit count by 721
units, based on maximum potential dwelling units in Planning Areas 11 and 12. DEIR,
p. 1-1. But curiously and contradictorily, the DEIR proceeds to state that "[i]t should
be noted that, as a worst-case scenario, 246,312 square feet of commercial uses and
637 multi-family dwelling units were utilized in the analysis of this DEIR." *Id.*

It is well-established that "[a]n accurate, stable and finite project description is the sine qua non of an informative and legally sufficient EIR." *County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles* (1977) 71 Cal.App.3d 185, 193. "A curtailed, enigmatic or unstable project description draws a red herring across the path of public input." *Id.* at p. 198. 8.17 cont.

8.18

However, the DEIR does not clearly disclose the total dwelling units allowed under the Project, upon approval of the proposed Amendment and the proposed increase of 721 dwelling units. Based on Table 3-1, SPA260, A3 Land Use Summary, the total allowed dwelling units allowed under the Specific Plan will be 1506. DEIR, p. 3-4. If that is the case, it's not clear why the DEIR is using the worst-case scenario of 637 multi-family dwelling units in all of the analysis in the DEIR, which is even lower than the proposed increase of 721 units.

Thus, the DEIR fails to accurately describe the Project and as a result, fails to adequately analyze and mitigate its impacts.

Simply put, the entire DEIR fails to analyze the Project as proposed. The entire DEIR 8.23 is deficient and fails to comply with CEQA.

C. <u>The DEIR Provides Vague and Unenforceable Mitigation Measures and</u> <u>Improperly Defers Formulation and Imposition of Performance-Based</u> <u>Mitigation Measures</u>

CEQA mitigation measures proposed and adopted into an environmental impact report are required to describe what actions will be taken to reduce or avoid an environmental impact. (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(a)(1)(B) [providing "[f]ormulation of mitigation measures should not be deferred until some future time."].) While the same Guidelines section 15126.5(a)(1)(B) acknowledges an exception to the rule against deferrals, but such exception is narrowly proscribed to situations where "measures may specify performance standards which would mitigate the significant effect of the project and which may be accomplished in more than one specified way." (*Id.*) Courts have also recognized a similar exception to the general rule against deferral of mitigation measures where the performance criteria for each mitigation measure is identified and described in the EIR. (*Sacramento Old City Ass'n v. City Council* (1991) 229 Cal.App.3d 1011.)

Impermissible deferral can occur when an EIR calls for mitigation measures to be created based on future studies or describes mitigation measures in general terms but the agency fails to commit itself to specific performance standards. (*Preserve Wild Santee v. City of Santee* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th 260, 281 [city improperly deferred mitigation to butterfly habitat by failing to provide standards or guidelines for its management]; *San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 645, 671 [EIR failed to provide and commit to specific criteria or

8.24

8.25

City of Menifee – Palomar Crossings January 21, 2020 Page 7 of 17

standard of performance for mitigating impacts to biological habitats]; see also Cleveland Nat'l Forest Found. v San Diego Ass'n of Gov'ts (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 413, 442 [generalized air quality measures in the EIR failed to set performance standards]; California Clean Energy Comm. v City of Woodland (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 195 [agency could not rely on a future report on urban decay with no standards for determining whether mitigation required]; POET, LLC v. State Air Resources Bd. (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 681, 740 [agency could not rely on future rulemaking to establish specifications to ensure emissions of nitrogen oxide would not increase because it did not establish objective performance criteria for measuring whether that goal would be achieved]; Gray v. County of Madera (2008) 167 Cal.App.4th 1099, 1119 [rejecting mitigation measure requiring replacement water to be provided to neighboring landowners because it identified a general goal for mitigation rather than specific performance standard]; Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. County of Orange (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 794 [requiring report without established standards is impermissible delay].)

Here, the DEIR is plagued by vague, deferred mitigation, and measures that lack appropriate performance standards:

- MM-AQ-2: During Project construction, the Project applicant shall install high-efficiency lighting (such as LEDs) that is at least 34% more efficient than standard lighting.
 - No enforceable performance standard or any specific criteria for implementation of what "standard" lighting is and vague.
- MM-GHG-1 Prior to occupancy, the Project applicant shall require that highefficiency lighting (such as LEDs) be installed that is at least 34% more efficient than standard lighting.
 - No enforceable performance standard or any specific criteria for implementation of what "standard" lighting is and vague.
- MM-ENR-5 Prior to occupancy the Project applicant shall provide secure onsite bicycle storage or cages for the residential uses
 - No enforceable performance standard on what "secure" is.
 - Vague as to how many bicycles the storage or cages should accommodate to mitigate the Project's impacts.
- MM-TR-4 Provide secure on-site bicycle storage or
- cages for the residential uses.

8.26

8.25

cont.

- No enforceable performance standard on what "secure" is.
- Vague as to how many bicycles the storage or cages should accommodate to mitigate the Project's impacts.
- MM-TR-5 Provide convenient/highly visible on-site bicycle parking racks for the commercial uses.
 - No enforceable performance standard on what "convenient" and "highly visible" on-site bicycle parking racks entail.
 - Vague as to where the bicycle parking racks should be located in relation to the entrances for commercial uses.
 - No enforceable way to ensure that the Project's significant traffic impacts could be mitigated to the extent feasible.
- MM-ENR-6 Prior to occupancy the Project applicant shall provide convenient/highly visible on-site bicycle parking racks for the commercial uses.
 - No enforceable performance standard on what "convenient" and "highly visible" on-site bicycle parking racks entail.
 - Vague as to where the bicycle parking racks should be located in relation to the entrances for commercial uses.
 - No enforceable way to ensure that the Project's significant energy impacts could be mitigated to the extent feasible.
- MM-NOI-1 During construction, the contractor shall ensure all construction equipment is equipped with appropriate noise attenuating devices and equipment shall be maintained so that vehicles and their loads are secured from rattling and banging. Idling equipment shall be turned off when not in use.
 - No enforceable performance standard on what "appropriate" noise attenuating devices and equipment entail.
 - No way to ensure no noise exceedances, e.g. requiring a contractor to measure noise levels throughout the day.
- MM-NOI-2 Construction staging areas should be located as far from noisesensitive land uses as reasonably feasible.
 - No enforceable performance standard on what "as far from" and "reasonably feasible" can be interpreted as.
- MM-HAZ-1 Pesticide Presence. Prior to any ground disturbance activities, the Project applicant shall submit a work plan to DTSC for review and approval.

8.26 cont.

0		
0	Improper deferral of preparation of a work plan until after Project Approval.	8.26 cont.
0	Improper deferral of characterization of the extent of the pesticide presence on the Project Site, including a Phase II investigation.	
As a result of CEQA.	of these improper and inadequate mitigation measures, the DEIR violates	8.27
D.	<u>The DEIR Fails to Adequately Disclose, Analyze and Mitigate the</u> <u>Project's Significant Air Quality Impacts</u>	
	in the comment letter by Mr. Matt Hagemann and Dr. Paul Rosenfeld of nich is attached hereto as Exhibit 3, the DEIR violates CEQA in the ays:	
under	of unsubstantiated input parameters for CalEEMod.206.3.2. were used that restimated Project emissions of incorrect trip purpose percentages was used in CalEEMod which may	8.28
- Use c	underestimated emissions of unsubstantiated application of mobile-related mitigation measures in the EMod without verifiable justification	
- Failur emiss	re to implement all feasible mitigation to reduce Project's significant NOx ions	
As a result, the DEIR fails to adequately analyze and mitigate the Project's air quality impacts and violates CEQA.		8.29
E.	<u>The DEIR Fails to Adequately Disclose, Analyze and Mitigate the</u> <u>Project's Significant Health Risk Emissions Impacts</u>	
e	o experts Mr. Matt Hagemann and Dr. Rosenfeld (see Exhibit 3), the tes CEQA in the following ways:	

The DEIR's use of a Localized Significance Threshold (LST) analysis rather than conducting a quantified Health Risk Assessment (HRA) resulted in an inadequate evaluation of Diesel Particulate Matter health risk emissions

8.30

The omission of a quantified HRA is inconsistent with the Risk Assessment -Guidelines by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)

- The DEIR's limited HRA related to operational mobile emissions (1) fails to include the Project's entire operational emissions as recommended by CalEEMod's User's Guide and (2) fails to evaluate the cumulative lifetime cancer risk to nearby, existing receptors as a result of Project construction and operation together, including all aspects of the Project.
 8.30 cont.
- A simple screening-level HRA indicates the Project will have a significant health risk impact not previously identified and analyzed by the DEIR

As a result, the DEIR fails to adequately analyze and mitigate the Project's health risk | 8.31 impacts and violates CEQA.

F. <u>The DEIR Fails to Adequately Disclose, Analyze and Mitigate the</u> <u>Project's Significant Greenhouse Gas Impacts</u>

According to experts Mr. Matt Hagemann and Dr. Rosenfeld (see Exhibit 3), the DEIR violates CEQA in several ways.

The DEIR fails to adequately evaluate greenhouse gas impacts because (1) California Air Resources Board (CARB)'s 2017 Scoping Plan is not a Climate Action Plan that qualifies under the CEQA Guidelines, (2) Uses incorrect and unsubstantiated analysis (from the incorrect air model and makes up its own adjusted threshold) that indicate a potentially significant GHG impact, (3) Updated CalEEMod output files, modeled by Mr. Hagemann and Dr. Rosenfeld, disclose that the Project's mitigated GHG emissions (both construction and operational) would approximately total 7.66 MT CO2e/SP/year, which exceeds the SCAQMD 2035 efficiency threshold of 3.0 MT CO₂e/SP/year, as well as the unsubstantiated interpolated 2023 threshold of 4.43 MT CO₂e/SP/year and SCAQMD 2020 efficiency threshold of 4.8 MT CO₂e/SP/year. Exhibit 3, p. 14-16.

The DEIR fails to mitigate the Project's GHG emissions to the extent feasible because Mr. Hagemann and Dr. Rosenfeld's analysis demonstrates that construction emissions may result in potentially significant impacts. Some of the feasible mitigation measures to mitigate the Project's construction GHG emissions that the DEIR must be revised to include are: (1) implementation of diesel control measures, (2) repower or replace older construction equipment engines, (3) install retrofit devices on existing construction equipment, (4) use electric and hybrid construction equipment, (5) implement a construction vehicle inventory tracking system, (5) "Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices" recommended by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality 8.33

Management District (SMAQMD), and (6) use of spray equipment with greater transfer efficiencies. Exhibit 3, p. 15-21.

As for operational GHG emissions, Mr. Hagemann and Dr. Rosenfeld recommend the DEIR to include various energy-related, transportation-related, water-related feasible mitigation measures and project design features as listed on Pages 20-21 of Exhibit 3.

G. The DEIR Fails to Adequately Analyze the Project's Cumulative Impacts

The CEQA Guidelines define cumulative impacts as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." (CEQA Guidelines §15355.) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or more than one project. (CEQA Guidelines §15355(a).) Cumulative impacts may result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time. (CEQA Guidelines §15355(b).) Even if the Project's impacts may not be significant, its incremental effects, when added to other past, present, and probable future projects, can be cumulatively significant. (CEQA Guidelines §§15065(a)(3), 15130(b)(1)(A), 15355(b).) Thus, in analyzing a Project's cumulative impacts, it's important to analyze not just impacts of the Project itself, but also consider impacts from all other related projects as well.

The DEIR fails to adequately analyze the Project's cumulative impacts across many disciplines. For example, for Population and Housing, the DEIR concludes, based on the fact that the Project would not have substantial numbers of existing people from housing, that there are no significant cumulative impacts. However, even a small incremental impact could be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, without analyzing whether other related Projects in combination with the Project could cause significant cumulative impacts, the DEIR's cumulative impacts analysis is deficient.

Similarly, the DEIR, without analysis of whether the Project, combined with related projects in the vicinity, would have cumulative impacts, concludes that "the aesthetic impacts associated with the change of land use will not represent any cumulative impact to aesthetics." DEIR, 4.2-20. The DEIR's hazards cumulative impacts analysis does not even take into consideration the impacts of pesticide residue combined with hazards impacts form related projects in the vicinity at all, only Project's impacts. *Id.*, 4.6-20. Then the DEIR concludes, without analysis, that "no cumulative impacts will occur." *Id.*, 4.6-21.

8.37

8.36

8.34

cont.

The DEIR's cumulative impact analyses focus solely on the Project level impacts that the DEIR simply repeats and renders the cumulative impacts analysis requirement redundant. As a result, the DEIR violates CEQA.

H. <u>The Project's DEIR Fails to Disclose and Analyze the Project's</u> <u>Significant and Unavoidable Impacts on Land Use</u>

The DEIR concludes, without analysis, that the Project will have no significant landuse impacts. DEIR, 4.8-8~9. In fact, while listing a host of General Plan Goals and Policies that are relevant to the Project, the DEIR did not discuss whether the Project is consistent or not consistent with each of those Goals and Policies.

The DEIR provides a brief description of the proposed amendments with SP260, A3 and cites to Table 3.1, SPA260, A3 Land Use Summary as providing "detailed descriptions of each change that is proposed by SP 260...." DEIR, 4.8-8~9. However, the description of the proposed Project is NOT an analysis of the Project's consistency with the City's General Plan.

CEQA requires that an environmental document analyze whether a Project would "[c]onflict with any applicable land use plan . . . adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect." CEQA Guidelines Appdx. G.

By failing to provide any consistency analysis, the DEIR fails to disclose significant and unavoidable environmental impacts from the Project's inconsistency with the City's General Plan. Most glaringly, the Project's violates the following Goals and Policies of the City of Menifee's General Plan:

- Policy LU-1.4 requires that the City "[p]reserve, protect, and enhance established rural, estate, and residential neighborhoods by providing sensitive and well-designed transitions (building design, landscape, etc.) between these neighborhoods and adjoining areas." However, increasing the Project density by 721 dwelling units is antithetical to preserving, protecting and enhancing established rural areas near the Project Site.
- Goal CD-4 requires that the City "[r]ecognize, preserve, and enhance the aesthetic value of the city's enhanced landscape corridors and scenic corridors." Again, the City has failed to explain how increasing the Project density by 721 dwelling units does not controvert the City's obligation to preserve and enhance the landscape and scenic corridors in and near the Project Site.

8.43

The City violated CEQA by failing to analyze whether the Project is consistent with its General Plan's Goals and Policies.

In addition, the DEIR's analysis of the Project's consistency with RTP/SCS Goals (Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy) is inaccurate and misleading. For example, Goal 6 of RTP/SCS, the City is required to "[p]rotect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (non-motorized transportation, such as bicycling and walking)." DEIR, 4.8-10~11. The DEIR states rather simply that the Project offers opportunities for vehicular and non-vehicular modes of transportation and thus protects the environment and health of residents in concluding that the Project is consistent with the goal of improving air quality. *Id.* However, the DEIR also admits that air quality will worsen by amending the Specific Plan to make the Project denser by 721 dwelling units. Thus, the DEIR's consistency analysis regarding RTP/SCS Goals is inaccurate and incomplete.

The DEIR fails to adequately disclose and analyze the Project's potentially significant [8.46] impacts on land use.

I. <u>CEQA Requires Revision and Recirculation of an Environmental Impact</u> <u>Report When Substantial Changes or New Information Comes to Light</u>

Section 21092.1 of the California Public Resources Code requires that "[w]hen significant new information is added to an environmental impact report after notice has been given pursuant to Section 21092 ... but prior to certification, the public agency shall give notice again pursuant to Section 21092, and consult again pursuant to Sections 21104 and 21153 before certifying the environmental impact report" in order to give the public a chance to review and comment upon the information. CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5.

Significant new information includes "changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information" that "deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative)." CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5(a). Examples of significant new information requiring recirculation include "new significant environmental impacts from the project or from a new mitigation measure," "substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact," "feasible project alternative or mitigation

8.47

measure considerably different from others previously analyzed" as well as when "the draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded." *Id*.

An agency has an obligation to recirculate an environmental impact report for public notice and comment due to "significant new information" regardless of whether the agency opts to include it in a project's environmental impact report. *Cadiz Land Co. v. Rail Cycle* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 74, 95 [finding that in light of a new expert report disclosing potentially significant impacts to groundwater supply "the EIR should have been revised and recirculated for purposes of informing the public and governmental agencies of the volume of groundwater at risk and to allow the public and governmental agencies to respond to such information."]. If significant new information was brought to the attention of an agency prior to certification, an agency is required to revise and recirculate that information as part of the environmental impact report.

After the City revises and adds information offered by these comments, the City must 8.50 recirculate the EIR before approval.

III. <u>THE PROJECT WOULD BE APPROVED IN VIOLATION OF THE</u> STATE PLANNING AND ZONING LAW

A. <u>Background Concerning the State Planning & Zoning Law</u>

California's Planning & Zoning Law, Cal. Government Code § 65000 *et seq* ("**Planning & Zoning Law**") requires California cities and counties to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan governing development. *Napa Citizens for Honest Gov. v. Napa County Bd. of Supervisors* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 342, 352, citing Gov. Code §§ 65030, 65300. The general plan sits at the top of the land use planning hierarchy (*see DeVita v. County of Napa* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 763, 773), and serves as a "constitution" or "charter" for all future development. *Lesher Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540.

General plan consistency is "the linchpin of California's land use and development laws; it is the principle which infused the concept of planned growth with the force of law." *See Debottari v. Norco City Council* (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 1204, 1213.

State law mandates two levels of consistency. First, a general plan must be internally or "horizontally" consistent: its elements must "comprise an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for the adopting agency." See Gov. 8.51

Code § 65300.5; *Sierra Club v. Bd. of Supervisors* (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 698, 704. A general plan amendment thus may not be internally inconsistent, nor may it cause the general plan as a whole to become internally inconsistent. *See DeVita*, 9 Cal.4th at 796 fn. 12. In addition, the Planning & Zoning Law requires "vertical" consistency, meaning that vening ordinances and other land use decisions also must be consistent with the

zoning ordinances and other land-use decisions also must be consistent with the general plan. See Gov. Code § 65860(a)(2) [land uses authorized by zoning ordinance must be "compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the [general] plan."]; *see also Neighborhood Action Group v. County of Calaveras* (1984) 156 Cal.App.3d 1176, 1184. A zoning ordinance that conflicts with the general plan or impedes the achievement of its policies is invalid and cannot be given effect. *See Lesher*, 52 Cal.3d at 544.

Finally, the Planning & Zoning Law requires that all subordinate land-use decisions, including conditional use permits, be consistent with the general plan. See Gov. Code § 65860(a)(2); *Neighborhood Action Group*, 156 Cal.App.3d at 1184.

A project cannot be found consistent with a general plan if it conflicts with a general plan policy that is "fundamental, mandatory, and clear," regardless of whether it is consistent with other general plan policies. *See Endangered Habitats League v. County of Orange* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 782-83; *Families Unafraid to Uphold Rural El Dorado County v. Bd. of Supervisors* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1332, 1341-42 ("*FUTURE*"). Moreover, even in the absence of such direct conflict, an ordinance or development project may not be approved if it interferes with or frustrates the general plan's policies and objectives. *See Napa Citizens*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 378-79; *see also Lesher*, 52 Cal.3d at 544 (zoning ordinance restricting development conflicted with growth-oriented policies of the general plan).

B. The Project is inconsistent with the City of Menifee General Plan

The DEIR lists numerous Goals and Policies of the City of Menifee General Plan that it purports are relevant to the Project. However, as discussed above, the DEIR fails to analyze whether the Project is consistent with each Goal and Policy of the General Plan.

The Project is inconsistent is at least two Goals and Policies of the General Plan. Land Use Policy LU-1.4 requires that the City "[p]reserve, protect, and enhance established rural, estate, and residential neighborhoods by providing sensitive and well-designed 8.56

8.58

transitions (building design, landscape, etc.) between these neighborhoods and adjoining areas." However, increasing the Project density by 721 dwelling units is antithetical to preserving, protecting and enhancing established rural areas near the Project Site.

The Project is inconsistent with Community Development Goal CD-4 requires that the City "[r]ecognize, preserve, and enhance the aesthetic value of the city's enhanced landscape corridors and scenic corridors." Again, increasing the Project density by 721 dwelling units directly contradicts the City's obligation to preserve and enhance the landscape and scenic corridors in and near the Project Site.

C. <u>The Project Is Inconsistent with the Regional Transportation</u> <u>Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals</u>

The Project is also inconsistent with Goal 6 of RTP/SCS (Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy) is inaccurate and misleading. Goal 6 requires the City to "[p]rotect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (non-motorized transportation, such as bicycling and walking)." DEIR, 4.8-10~11. The DEIR states rather simply that the Project offers opportunities for vehicular and non-vehicular modes of transportation and thus protects the environment and health of residents in concluding that the Project is consistent with the goal of improving air quality. *Id.* However, the DEIR's air quality analysis also admits that air quality will worsen by amending the Specific Plan to make the Project denser by 721 dwelling units. Therefore, based on the information provided in the DEIR, the Project is inconsistent with the RTP/SCS.

IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

Commenter requests that the City revise and recirculate the Project's environmental impact report to address the aforementioned concerns. If the City has any questions or concerns, feel free to contact my office.

Sincerely, Mitchell M. Tsai

Attorneys for Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters

8.61

8.60

City of Menifee – Palomar Crossings January 21, 2020 Page 17 of 17

Attached:

Air Quality and GHG Expert, Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg. – C.V. (Exhibit 1);

Air Quality and GHG Expert, Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. – C.V. (Exhibit 2);

Letter from Hagemann and Rosenfeld to Mitchell M. Tsai re Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Palomar Crossings Project with Exhibits (January 21, 2020) (**Exhibit 3**)

EXHIBIT 1



Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and Litigation Support for the Environment

> 1640 5th St., Suite 204 Santa Santa Monica, California 90401 Tel: (949) 887-9013 Email: <u>mhagemann@swape.com</u>

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

Geologic and Hydrogeologic Characterization Industrial Stormwater Compliance Investigation and Remediation Strategies Litigation Support and Testifying Expert 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 25 years of experience in environmental policy, assessment and remediation. 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) while also working with permit holders to improve hydrogeologic characterization and water quality monitoring.

Matt has worked closely with U.S. EPA legal counsel and the technical staff of several states in the application and enforcement of RCRA, Safe Drinking Water Act and Clean Water Act regulations. Matt has trained the technical staff in the States of California, Hawaii, Nevada, Arizona and the Territory of Guam in the conduct of investigations, groundwater fundamentals, and sampling techniques.

Positions Matt has held include:

- Founding Partner, Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE) (2003 present);
- Geology Instructor, Golden West College, 2010 2014;
- 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 100 environmental impact reports since 2003 under CEQA that identify significant issues with regard to hazardous waste, water resources, water quality, air quality, Valley Fever, 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 industrial facilities.
- Manager of a project to provide technical assistance to a community adjacent to a former Naval shipyard under a grant from the U.S. EPA.
- 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.
- Expert witness on two cases involving MTBE litigation.
- Expert witness and litigation support on the impact of air toxins and hazards at a school.
- Expert witness in litigation at a former plywood plant.

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.

<u>Hydrogeology:</u>

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 nation-wide 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.

<u>Teaching:</u>

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 taught physical geology (lecture and lab and introductory geology at Golden West College in Huntington Beach, California from 2010 to 2014.

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, Coloradao.

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 repesentatives, 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., Fukanaga, 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 Cleanup 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 DNAPLcontaminated 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 examination, 2009-2011.

EXHIBIT 2



Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

Chemical Fate and Transport & Air Dispersion Modeling

Principal Environmental Chemist

Risk Assessment & Remediation Specialist

Education

Ph.D. Soil Chemistry, University of Washington, 1999. Dissertation on VOC filtration.

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

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

Professional Experience

Dr. Rosenfeld is the Co-Founder and Principal Environmental Chemist at Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE). His focus is the fate and transport of environmental contaminants, risk assessment, and ecological restoration. His project experience ranges from monitoring and modeling of pollution sources as they relate to human and ecological health. Dr. Rosenfeld has investigated and designed remediation programs and risk assessments for contaminated sites containing, petroleum, MtBE and fuel oxygenates, chlorinated solvents, pesticides, radioactive waste, PCBs, PAHs, dioxins, furans, volatile organics, semi-volatile organics, perchlorate, heavy metals, asbestos, PFOA, unusual polymers, and odor. Significant projects performed by Dr. Rosenfeld include the following:

Litigation Support

Client: Missouri Department of Natural Resources (Jefferson City, Missouri)

Serving as an expert in evaluating air pollution and odor emissions from a Republic Landfill in St. Louis, Missouri. Conducted. Project manager overseeing daily, weekly and comprehensive sampling of odor and chemicals.

Client: Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (Baton Rouge, Louisiana)

Serving as an expert witness, conducting groundwater modeling of an ethylene dichloride DNAPL and soluble plume resulting from spill caused by Conoco Phillips.

Client: Missouri Department of Natural Resources (St. Louis, Missouri)

Serving as a consulting expert and potential testifying expert regarding a landfill fire directly adjacent to another landfill containing radioactive waste. Implemented an air monitoring program testing for over 100 different compounds using approximately 12 different analytical methods.

Client: Baron & Budd, P.C. (Dallas, Texas) and Weitz & Luxeinberg (New York, New York)

Served as a consulting expert in MTBE Federal Multi District Litigation (MDL) in New York. Consolidated ground water data, created maps for test cases, constructed damage model, evaluated taste and odor threshold levels. Resulted in a settlement of over \$440 million.

Client: The Buzbee Law Firm (Houston, Texas)

Served as a san expert in ongoing litigation involving over 50,000+ plaintiffs who are seeking compensation for chemical exposure and reduction in property value resulting from chemicals released from the BP facility.

Client: Environmental Litigation Group (Birmingham, Alabama)

Serving as an expert on property damage, medical monitoring and toxic tort claims that have been filed on behalf of over 13,000 plaintiffs who were exposed to PCBs and dioxins/furans resulting from emissions from Monsanto and Cerro Copper's operations in Sauget, Illinois. Developed AERMOD models to demonstrate plaintiff's exposure.

Client: Baron & Budd P.C. (Dallas Texas) and Korein Tillery (St. Louis, Missouri)

Served as a consulting expert for a Class Action defective product claim filed in Madison County, Illinois against Syngenta and five other manufacturers for atrazine. Evaluated health issues associated with atrazine and deterimied treatment cost for filtration of public drinking water supplies. Resulted in \$105 million dollar settlement.

Client: The Buzbee Law Firm (Houston, Texas)

Served as a consulting expert in catalyst release and refinery emissions cases against the BP Refinery in Texas City. A jury verdict for 10 employees exposed to catalyst via BP's irresponsible behavior.

Client: Baron & Budd, P.C. (Dallas, Texas)

Served as a consulting expert to calculate the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL) and No Significant Risk Level (NSRL), based on Cal EPA and OEHHA guidelines, for Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) in fish oil dietary supplements.

Client: Girardi Keese (Los Angeles, California)

Served as an expert testifying on hydrocarbon exposure of a woman who worked on a fuel barge operated by Chevron. Demonstrated that the plaintiff was exposed to excessive amounts of benzene.

Client: Mason & Cawood (Annapolis, Maryland) and Girardi & Keese (Los Angeles, California)

Serving as an expert consultant on the Battlefield Golf Club fly ash disposal site in Chesapeake, VA, where arsenic, other metals and radionuclides are leaching into groundwater, and ash is blowing off-site onto the surrounding communities.

Client: California Earth Mineral Corporation (Culver City, California)

Evaluating the montmorillonite clay deposit located near El Centro, California. Working as a Defense Expert representing an individual who owns a 2,500 acre parcel that will potentially be seized by the United States Navy via eminent domain.

Client: Matthews & Associates (Houston, Texas)

Serving as an expert witness, preparing air model demonstrating residential exposure via emissions from fracking in natural gas wells in Duncan, Texas.

Client: Baron & Budd P.C. (Dallas, Texas) and Korein Tillery (St. Louis, Missouri)

Served as a consulting expert for analysis of private wells relating to litigation regarding compensation of private well owners for MTBE testing. Coordinated data acquisition and GIS analysis evaluating private well proximity to leaking underground storage tanks.

Client: Lurie & Park LLP (Los Angeles, California)

Served as an expert witness evaluating a vapor intrusion toxic tort case that resulted in a settlement. The Superfund site is a 4 ½ mile groundwater plume of chlorinated solvents in Whittier, California.

Client: Mason & Cawood (Annapolis, Maryland)

Evaluated data from the Hess Gasoline Station in northern Baltimore, Maryland that had a release resulting in flooding of plaintiff's homes with gasoline-contaminated water, foul odor, and biofilm growth.

Client: The Buzbee Law Firm (Houston, Texas)

Evaluated air quality resulting from grain processing emissions in Muscatine, Iowa.

Client: Anderson Kill & Olick, P.C. (Ventura, California)

Evaluated historical exposure and lateral and vertical extent of contamination resulting from a ~150 million gallon Exxon Mobil tank farm located near Watts, California.

Client: Packard Law Firm (Petaluma, California)

Served as an expert witness, evaluated lead in Proposition 65 Case where various products were found to have elevated lead levels.

Client: The Buzbee Law Firm (Houston, Texas)

Evaluated data resulting from an oil spill in Port Arthur, Texas.

Client: Nexsen Pruet, LLC (Charleston, South Carolina)

Serving as expert in chlorine exposure in a railroad tank car accident where approximately 120,000 pounds of chlorine were released.

Client: Girardi & Keese (Los Angeles, California)

Serving as an expert investigating hydrocarbon exposure and property damage for ~600 individuals and ~280 properties in Carson, California where homes were constructed above a large tank farm formerly owned by Shell.

Client: Brent Coon Law Firm (Cleveland, Ohio)

Served as an expert, calculating an environmental exposure to benzene, PAHs, and VOCs from a Chevron Refinery in Hooven, Ohio. Conducted AERMOD modeling to determine cumulative dose.

Client: Lundy Davis (Lake Charles, Louisiana)

Served as consulting expert on an oil field case representing the lease holder of a contaminated oil field. Conducted field work evaluating oil field contamination in Sulphur, Louisiana. Property is owned by Conoco Phillips, but leased by Yellow Rock, a small oil firm.

Client: Cox Cox Filo (Lake Charles, Louisiana)

Served as testifying expert on a multimillion gallon oil spill in Lake Charles which occurred on June 19, 2006, resulting in hydrocarbon vapor exposure to hundreds of workers and residents. Prepared air model and calculated exposure concentration. Demonstrated that petroleum odor alone can result in significant health harms.

Client: Cotchett Pitre & McCarthy (San Francisco, California)

Served as testifying expert representing homeowners who unknowingly purchased homes built on an old oil field in Santa Maria, California. Properties have high concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons in subsurface soils resulting in diminished property value.

Client: Law Offices Of Anthony Liberatore P.C. (Los Angeles, California)

Served as testifying expert representing individuals who rented homes on the Inglewood Oil Field in California. Plaintiffs were exposed to hydrocarbon contaminated water and air, and experienced health harms associated with the petroleum exposure.

Client: Orange County District Attorney (Orange County, California)

Coordinated a review of 143 ARCO gas stations in Orange County to assist the District Attorney's prosecution of CCR Title 23 and California Health and Safety Code violators.

Client: Environmental Litigation Group (Birmingham, Alabama)

Served as a testifying expert in a health effects case against ABC Coke/Drummond Company for polluting a community with PAHs, benzene, particulate matter, heavy metals, and coke oven emissions. Created air dispersion models and conducted attic dust sampling, exposure modeling, and risk assessment for plaintiffs.

Client: Masry & Vitatoe (Westlake Village, California), Engstrom Lipscomb Lack (Los Angeles, Califronia) and Baron & Budd P.C. (Dallas, Texas)

Served as a consulting expert in Proposition 65 lawsuit filed against major oil companies for benzene and toluene releases from gas stations and refineries resulting in contaminated groundwater. Settlement included over \$110 million dollars in injunctive relief.

Client: Tommy Franks Law Firm (Austin, Texas)

Served as expert evaluating groundwater contamination which resulted from the hazardous waste injection program and negligent actions of Morton Thiokol and Rohm Hass. Evaluated drinking water contamination and community exposure.

Client: Baron & Budd P.C. (Dallas, Texas) and Sher Leff (San Francisco, California)

Served as consulting expert for several California cities that filed defective product cases against Dow Chemical and Shell for 1,2,3-trichloropropane groundwater contamination. Generated maps showing capture zones of impacted wells for various municipalities.

Client: Weitz & Luxenberg (New York, New York)

Served as expert on Property Damage and Nuisance claims resulting from emissions from the Countywide Landfill in Ohio. The landfill had an exothermic reaction or fire resulting from aluminum dross dumping, and the EPA fined the landfill \$10,000,000 dollars.

Client: Baron & Budd P.C. (Dallas, Texas)

Served as a consulting expert for a groundwater contamination case in Pensacola, Florida where fluorinated compounds contaminated wells operated by Escambia County.

Client: Environmental Litigation Group (Birmingham, Alabama)

Served as an expert on groundwater case where Exxon Mobil and Helena Chemical released ethylene dichloride into groundwater resulting in a large plume. Prepared report on the appropriate treatment technology and cost, and flaws with the proposed on-site remediation.

Client: Environmental Litigation Group (Birmingham, Alabama)

Served as an expert on air emissions released when a Bartlo Packaging Incorporated facility in West Helena, Arkansas exploded resulting in community exposure to pesticides and smoke from combustion of pesticides.

Client: Omara & Padilla (San Diego, California)

Served as a testifying expert on nuisance case against Nutro Dogfood Company that constructed a large dog food processing facility in the middle of a residential community in Victorville, California with no odor control devices. The facility has undergone significant modifications, including installation of a regenerative thermal oxidizer.

Client: Environmental Litigation Group (Birmingham, Alabama)

Serving as an expert on property damage and medical monitoring claims that have been filed against International Paper resulting from chemical emissions from facilities located in Bastrop, Louisiana; Prattville, Alabama; and Georgetown, South Carolina.

Client: Estep and Shafer L.C. (Kingwood, West Virginia)

Served as expert calculating acid emissions doses to residents resulting from coal-fired power plant emissions in West V

irginia using various air models.

Client: Watts Law Firm (Austin, Texas), Woodfill & Pressler (Houston, Texas) and Woska & Associates (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma)

Served as testifying expert on community and worker exposure to CCA, creosote, PAHs, and dioxins/furans from a BNSF and Koppers Facility in Somerville, Texas. Conducted field sampling, risk assessment, dose assessment and air modeling to quantify exposure to workers and community members.

Client: Environmental Litigation Group (Birmingham, Alabama)

Served as expert regarding community exposure to CCA, creosote, PAHs, and dioxins/furans from a Louisiana Pacific wood treatment facility in Florala, Alabama. Conducted blood sampling and environmental sampling to determine environmental exposure to dioxins/furans and PAHs.

Client: Sanders Law Firm (Colorado Springs, Colorado) and Vamvoras & Schwartzberg (Lake Charles, Louisiana)

Served as an expert calculating chemical exposure to over 500 workers from large ethylene dichloride spill in Lake Charles, Louisiana at the Conoco Phillips Refinery.

Client: Baron & Budd P.C. (Dallas, Texas)

Served as consulting expert in a defective product lawsuit against Dow Agroscience focusing on Clopyralid, a recalcitrant herbicide that damaged numerous compost facilities across the United States.

Client: Sullivan Papain Block McGrath & Cannavo (New York, New York) and The Cochran Firm (Dothan, Mississippi)

Served as an expert regarding community exposure to metals, PAHs PCBs, and dioxins/furans from the burning of Ford paint sludge and municipal solid waste in Ringwood, New Jersey.

Client: Rose, Klein & Marias LLP (Los Angeles, California)

Served as an expert in 55 Proposition 65 cases against individual facilities in the Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach. Prepared air dispersion and risk models to demonstrate that each facility emits diesel particulate matter that results in risks exceeding 1/100,000, hence violating the Proposition 65 Statute.

Client: Rose, Klein & Marias LLP (Los Angeles, California) and Environmental Law Foundation (San Francisco, California)

Served as an expert in a Proposition 65 case against potato chip manufacturers. Conducted an analysis of several brands of potato chips for acrylamide concentrations and found that all samples exceeded Proposition 65 No Significant Risk Levels.

Client: Gonzales & Robinson (Westlake Village, California)

Served as a testifying expert in a toxic tort case against Chevron (Ortho) for allowing a community to be contaminated with lead arsenate pesticide. Created air dispersion and soil vadose zone transport models, and evaluated bioaccumulation of lead arsenate in food.

Client: Environment Now (Santa Monica, California)

Served as expert for Environment Now to convince the State of California to file a nuisance claim against automobile manufactures to recover MediCal damages from expenditures on asthma-related health care costs.

Client: Trutanich Michell (Long Beach, California)

Served as expert representing San Pedro Boat Works in the Port of Los Angeles. Prepared air dispersion, particulate air dispersion, and storm water discharge models to demonstrate that Kaiser Bulk Loading is responsible for copper concentrate accumulating in the bay sediment.

Client: Azurix of North America (Fort Myers, Florida)

Provided expert opinions, reports and research pertaining to a proposed County Ordinance requiring biosolids applicators to measure VOC and odor concentrations at application sites' boundaries.

Client: MCP Polyurethane (Pittsburg, Kansas)

Provided expert opinions and reports regarding metal-laden landfill runoff that damaged a running track by causing the reversion of the polyurethane due to its catalytic properties.

Risk Assessment And Air Modeling

Client: Hager, Dewick & Zuengler, S.C. (Green Bay, Wisconsin)

Conducted odor audit of rendering facility in Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Client: ABT-Haskell (San Bernardino, California)

Prepared air dispersion model for a proposed state-of-the-art enclosed compost facility. Prepared a traffic analysis and developed odor detection limits to predict 1, 8, and 24-hour off-site concentrations of sulfur, ammonia, and amine.

Client: Jefferson PRP Group (Los Angeles, California)

Evaluated exposure pathways for chlorinated solvents and hexavalent chromium for human health risk assessment of Los Angeles Academy (formerly Jefferson New Middle School) operated by Los Angeles Unified School District.

Client: Covanta (Susanville, California)

Prepared human health risk assessment for Covanta Energy focusing on agricultural worker exposure to caustic fertilizer.

Client: CIWMB (Sacramento, California)

Used dispersion models to estimate traveling distance and VOC concentrations downwind from a composting facility for the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

Client: Carboquimeca (Bogotá, Columbia)

Evaluated exposure pathways for human health risk assessment for a confidential client focusing on significant concentrations of arsenic and chlorinated solvents present in groundwater used for drinking water.

Client: Navy Base Realignment and Closure Team (Treasure Island, California)

Used Johnson-Ettinger model to estimate indoor air PCB concentrations and compared estimated values with empirical data collected in homes.

Client: San Diego State University (San Diego, California)

Measured CO_2 flux from soils amended with different quantities of biosolids compost at Camp Pendleton to determine CO_2 credit values for coastal sage under fertilized and non-fertilized conditions.

Client: Navy Base Realignment and Closure Team (MCAS Tustin, California)

Evaluated cumulative risk of a multiple pathway scenario for a child resident and a construction worker. Evaluated exposure to air and soil via particulate and vapor inhalation, incidental soil ingestion, and dermal contact with soil.

Client: MCAS Miramar (San Diego, California)

Evaluated exposure pathways of metals in soil by comparing site data to background data. Risk assessment incorporated multiple pathway scenarios assuming child resident and construction worker particulate and vapor inhalation, soil ingestion, and dermal soil contact.

Client: Naval Weapons Station (Seal Beach, California)

Used a multiple pathway model to generate dust emission factors from automobiles driving on dirt roads. Calculated bioaccumulation of metals, PCBs, dioxin congeners and pesticides to estimate human and ecological risk.

Client: King County, Douglas County (Washington State)

Measured PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from windblown soil treated with biosolids and a polyacrylamide polymer in Douglas County, Washington. Used Pilat Mark V impactor for measurement and compared data to EPA particulate regulations.

Client: King County (Seattle, Washington)

Created emission inventory for several compost and wastewater facilities comparing VOC, particulate, and fungi concentrations to NIOSH values estimating risk to workers and individuals at neighboring facilities.

Air Pollution Investigation and Remediation

Client: Republic Landfill (Santa Clarita, California)

Managed a field investigation of odor around a landfill during 30+ events. Used hedonic tone, butanol scale, dilution-to-threshold values, and odor character to evaluate odor sources and character and intensity.

Client: California Biomass (Victorville, California)

Managed a field investigation of odor around landfill during 9+ events. Used hedonic tone, butanol scale, dilution-to-threshold values, and odor character to evaluate odor sources, character and intensity.

Client: ABT-Haskell (Redlands, California)

Assisted in permitting a compost facility that will be completely enclosed with a complex scrubbing system using acid scrubbers, base scrubbers, biofilters, heat exchangers and chlorine to reduce VOC emissions by 99 percent.

Client: Synagro (Corona, California)

Designed and monitored 30-foot by 20-foot by 6-foot biofilter for VOC control at an industrial composting facility in Corona, California to reduce VOC emissions by 99 percent.

Client: Jeff Gage (Tacoma, Washington)

Conducted emission inventory at industrial compost facility using GC/MS analyses for VOCs. Evaluated effectiveness of VOC and odor control systems and estimated human health risk.

Client: Daishowa America (Port Angeles Mill, Washington)

Analyzed industrial paper sludge and ash for VOCs, heavy metals and nutrients to develop a land application program. Metals were compared to federal guidelines to determine maximum allowable land application rates.

Client: Jeff Gage (Puyallup, Washington)

Measured effectiveness of biofilters at composting facility and conducted EPA dispersion models to estimate traveling distance of odor and human health risk from exposure to volatile organics.

Surface Water, Groundwater, and Wastewater Investigation/Remediation

Client: Confidential (Downey, California)

Managed groundwater investigation to determine horizontal extent of 1,000 foot TCE plume associated with a metal finishing shop.

Client: Confidential (West Hollywood, California)

Designing soil vapor extraction system that is currently being installed for confidential client. Managing groundwater investigation to determine horizontal extent of TCE plume associated with dry cleaning.

Client: Synagro Technologies (Sacramento, California)

Managed groundwater investigation to determine if biosolids application impacted salinity and nutrient concentrations in groundwater.

Client: Navy Base Realignment and Closure Team (Treasure Island, California)

Assisted in the design and remediation of PCB, chlorinated solvent, hydrocarbon and lead contaminated groundwater and soil on Treasure Island. Negotiated screening levels with DTSC and Water Board. Assisted in the preparation of FSP/QAPP, RI/FS, and RAP documents and assisted in CEQA document preparation.

Client: Navy Base Realignment and Closure Team (MCAS Tustin, California)

Assisted in the design of groundwater monitoring systems for chlorinated solvents at Tustin MCAS. Contributed to the preparation of FS for groundwater treatment.

Client: Mission Cleaning Facility (Salinas, California)

Prepared a RAP and cost estimate for using an oxygen releasing compound (ORC) and molasses to oxidize diesel fuel in soil and groundwater at Mission Cleaning in Salinas.

Client: King County (Washington)

Established and monitored experimental plots at a US EPA Superfund Site in wetland and upland mine tailings contaminated with zinc and lead in Smelterville, Idaho. Used organic matter and pH adjustment for wetland remediation and erosion control.

Client: City of Redmond (Richmond, Washington)

Collected storm water from compost-amended and fertilized turf to measure nutrients in urban runoff. Evaluated effectiveness of organic matter-lined detention ponds on reduction of peak flow during storm events. Drafted compost amended landscape installation guidelines to promote storm water detention and nutrient runoff reduction.

Client: City of Seattle (Seattle, Washington)

Measured VOC emissions from Renton wastewater treatment plant in Washington. Ran GC/MS, dispersion models, and sensory panels to characterize, quantify, control and estimate risk from VOCs.

Client: Plumas County (Quincy, California)

Installed wetland to treat contaminated water containing 1% copper in an EPA Superfund site. Revegetated 10 acres of acidic and metal laden sand dunes resulting from hydraulic mining. Installed and monitored piezometers in wetland estimating metal loading.

Client: Adams Egg Farm (St. Kitts, West Indies)

Designed, constructed, and maintained 3 anaerobic digesters at Springfield Egg Farm, St. Kitts. Digesters treated chicken excrement before effluent discharged into sea. Chicken waste was converted into methane cooking gas.

Client: BLM (Kremmling, Colorado)

Collected water samples for monitoring program along upper stretch of the Colorado River. Rafted along river and protected water quality by digging and repairing latrines.

Soil Science and Restoration Projects

Client: Hefner, Stark & Marois, LLP (Sacramento, California)

Facilitated in assisting Hefner, Stark & Marois, LLP in working with the Regional Water Quality board to determine how to utilize Calcium Participate as a by-product of processing sugar beets.

Client: Kinder Morgan (San Diego County, California)

Designed and monitored the restoration of a 110-acre project on Camp Pendleton along a 26-mile pipeline. Managed crew of 20, planting coastal sage, riparian, wetland, native grassland, and marsh ecosystems. Negotiated with the CDFW concerning species planting list and success standards.

Client: NAVY BRAC (Orote Landfill, Guam)

Designed and monitored pilot landfill cap mimicking limestone forest. Measured different species' root-penetration into landfill cap. Plants were used to evapotranspirate water, reducing water leaching through soil profile.

Client: LA Sanitation District Puente Hills Landfill (Whittier, California)

Monitored success of upland and wetland mitigation at Puente Hills Landfill operated by Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles. Negotiated with the Army Corps of Engineers and CDFG to obtain an early sign-off.

Client: City of Escondido (Escondido, California)

Designed, managed, installed, and monitored a 20-acre coastal sage scrub restoration project at Kit Carson Park, Escondido, California.

Client: Home Depot (Encinitas, California)

Designed, managed, installed and monitored a 15-acre coastal sage scrub and wetland restoration project at Home Depot in Encinitas, California.

Client: Alvarado Water Filtration Plant (San Diego, California)

Planned, installed and monitored 2-acre riparian and coastal sage scrub mitigation in San Diego California.

Client: Monsanto and James River Corporation (Clatskanie, Oregon)

Served as a soil scientist on a 50,000-acre hybrid poplar farm. Worked on genetically engineering study of Poplar trees to see if glyphosate resistant poplar clones were economically viable.

Client: World Wildlife Fund (St. Kitts, West Indies)

Managed 2-year biodiversity study, quantifying and qualifying the various flora and fauna in St. Kitts' expanding volcanic rainforest. Collaborated with skilled botanists, ornithologists and herpetologists.

Publications

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 Aermod and Empirical Data. American Journal of Environmental Science, 2012, 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.** (2011). PCBs and Dioxins/Furans in Attic Dust Collected Near Former PCB Production and Secondary Copper Facilities in Sauget, IL. *Procedia Environmental Sciences* 4(2011):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', in Brebbia, C.A. and Popov, V., eds., *Air Pollution XVII: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Modelling, Monitoring and Management of Air Pollution*, Tallinn, Estonia. 20-22 July, 2009, Southampton, Boston. WIT Press.

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, Volume 70 (2008) page 002254.

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, Volume 70 (2008) page 000527.

Hensley, A.R. A. Scott, J. J. J. Clark, **P. E. Rosenfeld** (2007) "Attic Dust and Human Blood Samples Collected near a Former Wood Treatment Facility" Environmental Research. 105, pp 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," Elsevier Publishing, Boston Massachusetts.

Rosenfeld P.E., and Suffet, I.H. (Mel) (2007) "Anatomy Of An Odor Wheel" Water Science and Technology, In Press.

Rosenfeld, P.E., Clark, J.J.J., Hensley A.R., Suffet, I.H. (Mel) (2007) "The use of an odor wheel classification for evaluation of human health risk criteria for compost facilities." Water Science And Technology, In Press.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., **Rosenfeld P.E.**, Clark, J.J.J. (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, August 21 – 25, 2006. Radisson SAS Scandinavia Hotel in Oslo Norway.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Suffet I.H. (2004) "Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash", Water Science and Technology, Vol. 49, No. 9. pp. 171-178.

Rosenfeld, P.E., Clark J. J. and Suffet, I.H. (2004) "Value of and Urban Odor Wheel." (2004). 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. Vol. 49, No. 9. pp 193-199.

Rosenfeld, **P.E.**, and Suffet I.H. (2004) "Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash", Water Science and Technology, Vol. 49, No. 9. pp. 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 JUL-AUG 2004.

Rosenfeld, P. E., Grey, M., (2003) Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. Seventh International In Situ And On Site Bioremediation Symposium. Batelle Conference Orlando Florida. June 2 and June 6, 2003.

Rosenfeld, P.E., Grey, M and Suffet, M. 2002. "Controlling Odors Using High Carbon Wood Ash." Biocycle, March 2002, Page 42.

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. April 2002.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and C.L. Henry. 2001. Characterization of odor emissions from three different biosolids. Water Soil and Air pollution. Vol. 127 Nos. 1-4, pp. 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: 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: 388-392.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Henry C. L., 2001. High carbon wood ash effect on biosolids microbial activity and odor. Water Environment Research. Volume 131 No. 1-4, pp. 247-262.

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. Bellevue Washington.

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

P. Rosenfeld. 1992. The Mount Liamuiga Crater Trail. Heritage Magazine of St. Kitts, Vol. 3 No. 2.

P. Rosenfeld. 1993. High School Biogas Project to Prevent Deforestation On St. Kitts. Biomass Users Network, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1993.

P. Rosenfeld. 1992. British West Indies, St. Kitts. Surf Report, April issue.

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

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

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

England Environmental Agency, 2002. Landfill Gas Control Technologies. Publishing Organization Environment Agency, Rio House, Waterside Drive, Aztec West, Almondsbury BRISTOL, BS32 4UD.

Presentations

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.** "Atrazine: A Persistent Pesticide in Urban Drinking Water." Urban Environmental Pollution, Boston, MA, June 20-23, 2010.

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.** "Bringing Environmental Justice to East St. Louis, Illinois." Urban Environmental Pollution, Boston, MA, June 20-23, 2010.

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

Rosenfeld, P.E. (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" Presentation at the 2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting, April 19-23, 2009. Tuscon, AZ.

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

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

Rosenfeld, P. E. (2007) "Somerville Community Exposure To Contaminants From Wood Treatment Facility Emissions" Poster Presentation at the 23rd Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water, October 15-18, 2007. University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

Rosenfeld P. E. "Production, Chemical Properties, Toxicology, & Treatment Case Studies of 1,2,3-Trichloropropane (TCP)" – Platform Presentation at the Association for Environmental Health and Sciences (AEHS) Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA, 3/2007.

Rosenfeld P. E. "Blood and Attic Sampling for Dioxin/Furan, PAH, and Metal Exposure in Florala, Alabama" – Platform Presentation at the AEHS Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA, 3/2007.

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

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. "Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals." Mealey's C8/PFOA Science, Risk & Litigation Conference" October 24, 25. The Rittenhouse Hotel, Philadelphia.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. "Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, Toxicology and Remediation PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference. September 19. Hilton Hotel, Irvine California.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. "Fate, Transport, Toxicity, And Persistence of 1,2,3-TCP." PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference. September 19. Hilton Hotel in Irvine, California.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. "Fate, Transport and Persistence of PDBEs." Mealey's Groundwater Conference. September 26, 27. Ritz Carlton Hotel, Marina Del Ray, California.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. "Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals." International Society of Environmental Forensics: Focus On Emerging Contaminants. June 7,8. Sheraton Oceanfront Hotel, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D. "Rate Transport, Persistence and Toxicology of PFOA and Related Perfluorochemicals". 2005 National Groundwater Association Ground Water And Environmental Law Conference. July 21-22, 2005. Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

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

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

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D., 2004. Perchlorate Toxicology. Presentation to a meeting of the American Groundwater Trust. March 7th, 2004. Pheonix Arizona.

Hagemann, M.F., **Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and Rob Hesse, 2004. Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. Invited presentation to a meeting of tribal representatives, Parker, AZ.

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

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

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. California CUPA Forum. Marriott Hotel. Anaheim California. February 6-7, 2003.

Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. EPA Underground Storage Tank Roundtable. Sacramento California. October 23, 2002.

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

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

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

Rosenfeld, P.E. and Grey, M. A. 2002. Soil Science Society Annual Conference. Indianapolis, Maryland. November 11-14.

Rosenfeld. P.E. 2000. Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. Water Environment Federation. Anaheim California. September 16, 2000.

Rosenfeld. P. E. 2000. Wood ash and biofilter control of compost odor. Biofest. October 16, 2000.Ocean Shores, California.

Rosenfeld, P. E. 2000. Bioremediation Using Organic Soil Amendments. California Resource Recovery Association. 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. 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. 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, Seattle Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry. 1998. Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions from Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. Biofest Lake Chelan, 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, Anaheim California.

Professional History

Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE); 2003 to present; Founding And Managing Partner UCLA School of Public Health; 2007 to 2010; Lecturer (Asst Res) 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 Bureau of Land Management, Kremmling Colorado 1990; Scientist

Teaching Experience

UCLA Department of Environmental Health (Summer 2003 through 2010) Taught Environmental Health Science 100 to students, including undergrad, medical doctors, public health professionals and nurses. Course focuses 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.

Cases that Dr. Rosenfeld Provided Deposition or Trial Testimony

In the Court of Common Pleas of Tuscarawas County Ohio John Michael Abicht, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Republic Services, Inc., et al., *Defendants* Case Number: 2008 CT 10 0741 (Cons. w/ 2009 CV 10 0987)

- In the Court of Common Pleas for the Second Judicial Circuit, State of South Carolina, County of Aiken David Anderson, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Norfolk Southern Corporation, et al., *Defendants*. Case Number: 2007-CP-02-1584
- In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama Jaeanette Moss Anthony, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Drummond Company Inc., et al., *Defendants* Civil action No. CV 2008-2076
- In the Ninth Judicial District Court, Parish of Rapides, State of Louisiana Roger Price, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Roy O. Martin, L.P., et al., *Defendants*. Civil Suit Number 224,041 Division G
- In the United States District Court, Western District Lafayette Division Ackle et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Citgo Petroleum Corporation, et al., *Defendants*. Case Number 2:07CV1052
- In the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Carolyn Baker, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Chevron Oil Company, et al., *Defendants*. Case Number 1:05 CV 227
- In the Fourth Judicial District Court, Parish of Calcasieu, State of Louisiana Craig Steven Arabie, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Citgo Petroleum Corporation, et al., *Defendants*. Case Number 07-2738 G
- In the Fourteenth Judicial District Court, Parish of Calcasieu, State of Louisiana Leon B. Brydels, *Plaintiffs*, vs. Conoco, Inc., et al., *Defendants*. Case Number 2004-6941 Division A
- In the District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, 153rd Judicial District Linda Faust, *Plaintiff*, vs. Burlington Northern Santa Fe Rail Way Company, Witco Chemical Corporation A/K/A Witco Corporation, Solvents and Chemicals, Inc. and Koppers Industries, Inc., *Defendants*. Case Number 153-212928-05
- In the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of San Bernardino

 Leroy Allen, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Nutro Products, Inc., a California Corporation and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, *Defendants*.
 John Loney, Plaintiff, vs. James H. Didion, Sr.; Nutro Products, Inc.; DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, *Defendants*.
 Case Number VCVVS044671
- 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 Number 2:09-cv-232-WHA-TFM
- In the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Los Angeles Leslie Hensley and Rick Hensley, *Plaintiffs*, vs. Peter T. Hoss, as trustee on behalf of the Cone Fee Trust; Plains Exploration & Production Company, a Delaware corporation; Rayne Water Conditioning, Inc., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, *Defendants*. Case Number SC094173

- In the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Santa Barbara, Santa Maria Branch Clifford and Shirley Adelhelm, et al., all individually, *Plaintiffs*, vs. Unocal Corporation, a Delaware Corporation; Union Oil Company of California, a California corporation; Chevron Corporation, a California corporation; ConocoPhillips, a Texas corporation; Kerr-McGee Corporation, an Oklahoma corporation; and DOES 1 though 100, *Defendants*. Case Number 1229251 (Consolidated with case number 1231299)
- In the United States District Court for Eastern District of Arkansas, Eastern District of Arkansas Harry Stephens Farms, Inc, and Harry Stephens, individual and as managing partner of Stephens Partnership, *Plaintiffs*, vs. Helena Chemical Company, and Exxon Mobil Corp., successor to Mobil Chemical Co., *Defendants*.
 - Case Number 2:06-CV-00166 JMM (Consolidated with case number 4:07CV00278 JMM)
- In the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Texarkana Division Rhonda Brasel, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Weyerhaeuser Company and DOES 1 through 100, *Defendants*. Civil Action Number 07-4037
- In The Superior Court of the State of California County of Santa Cruz Constance Acevedo, et al. *Plaintiffs* Vs. California Spray Company, et al. *Defendants* Case No CV 146344
- In the District Court of Texas 21st Judicial District of Burleson County Dennis Davis, *Plaintiff*, vs. Burlington Northern Santa Fe Rail Way Company, *Defendant*. Case Number 25,151

In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division Kyle Cannon, Eugene Donovan, Genaro Ramirez, Carol Sassler, and Harvey Walton, each Individually and on behalf of those similarly situated, *Plaintiffs*, vs. BP Products North America, Inc., *Defendant*. Case 3:10-cv-00622

EXHIBIT 3



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

January 21, 2020

Mitchell M. Tsai 155 South El Molino Avenue Suite 104 Pasadena, CA 91101

Subject: Comments on the Palomar Crossings Project (SCH No. 2019029123)

Dear Mr. Tsai,

We have reviewed the December 2019 Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for the Palomar Crossings ("Project") located in the City of Menifee ("City"). The Project proposes to construct an apartment building with either 721 or 637 dwelling units, a 246,312-square-foot retail and commercial shopping center, and 574,727-square-feet of parking areas on the 43-acre site.

Our review concludes that the DEIR fails to adequately evaluate the Project's Air Quality, Health Risk, and Greenhouse Gas impacts. As a result, emissions and health risk impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project are underestimated and inadequately addressed. An updated EIR should be prepared to adequately assess and mitigate the potential air quality and health risk impacts that the project may have on the surrounding environment.

Air Quality

Failure to Conservatively Analyze the Project

The DEIR indicates that the Project would result in an increase of 721 dwelling units, but analyzes a "worst-case scenario" of 637 multi family dwelling units, stating:

"Upon approval of SPA 260, A3, total dwelling unit count <u>shall increase by 721 units</u>, based on maximum potential dwelling units in Planning Areas 11 and 12. It should be noted that, as a <u>worst-case scenario</u>, 246,312 square feet of commercial uses and <u>637 multi-family dwelling units</u> were utilized in the analysis of this DEIR" (emphasis added) (p. 1-1).

8.64

As you can see in the above excerpt, the DEIR is unclear about whether the Project would involve the construction of 721 or 637 dwelling units. Consistent with the DEIR's air quality and greenhouse gas analysis, our letter analyzes 637 units. However, an updated EIR should be prepared specifying the specific number of dwelling units that are included in the Project. Furthermore, if the correct number of dwelling units is 721, the EIR should include an updated analysis of the Project's impacts that includes 721 dwelling units, as opposed to 637 dwelling units. CEQA Guidelines § 15003(f) articulates that CEQA requires "the fullest possible protection to the environment," and, as such, an updated EIR should consider the correct number of dwelling units to be created with the proposed Project.

Unsubstantiated Input Parameters Used to Estimate Project Emissions

The DEIR's air quality analysis relies on emissions calculated with CalEEMod.2016.3.2.¹ CalEEMod provides recommended default values based on site-specific information, such as land use type, meteorological data, total lot acreage, project type and typical equipment associated with project type. If more specific project information is known, the user can change the default values and input project-specific values, but the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that such changes be justified by substantial evidence.² Once all of the values are inputted into the model, the Project's construction and operational emissions are calculated, and "output files" are generated. These output files disclose to the reader what parameters were utilized in calculating the Project's air pollutant emissions and make known which default values were changed as well as provide justification for the values selected.³

Review of the Project's air modeling demonstrates that the DEIR underestimates emissions associated with Project activities. As previously stated, the DEIR's air quality analysis relies on air pollutant emissions calculated using CalEEMod. When reviewing the Project's CalEEMod output files, provided as Appendix B to the DEIR, we found that several of the values inputted into the model were not consistent with information disclosed in the DEIR. As a result, the Project's construction and operational emissions are underestimated. An updated EIR should be prepared to include an updated air quality analysis that adequately evaluates the impacts that construction and operation of the Project will have on local and regional air quality.

Use of Incorrect Trip Purpose Percentages

Review of the Project's CalEEMod output files demonstrates that the percentage of pass-by trips was reduced to zero and reallocated to both the diverted and primary trip percentages. As a result, the model may underestimate the Project's mobile-source operational emissions.

8.66 cont.

8.67

8.68

¹ CAPCOA (November 2017) CalEEMod User's Guide, <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf?sfvrsn=4</u>.

² CAPCOA (November 2017) CalEEMod User's Guide, <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf?sfvrsn=4</u>, p. 1, 9. ³ CAPCOA (November 2017) CalEEMod User's Guide, <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-</u>

<u>source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf?sfvrsn=4</u>, fn 1, p. 11, 12 – 13. A key feature of the CalEEMod program is the "remarks" feature, where the user explains why a default setting was replaced by a "user defined" value. These remarks are included in the report.

CalEEMod separates the operational trip purposes into three categories: primary, diverted, and pass-by trips. According to Appendix A of the CalEEMod User's Guide, the primary trips utilize the complete trip lengths associated with each trip type category. Diverted trips are assumed to take a slightly different path than a primary trip and are assumed to be 25% of the primary trip lengths. Pass-by trips are assumed to be 0.1 miles in length and are a result of no diversion from the primary route.⁴ Review of the Project's CalEEMod output files demonstrates that pass-by trips were reduced to zero and reallocated to both diverted and primary trips (see excerpt below) (Appendix B, pp. 79, 111, 144).

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblVehicleTrips	DV_TP	11.00	13.00
tblVehicleTrips	DV_TP	35.00	40.50
tblVehicleTrips	PB_TP	3.00	0.00
tblVehicleTrips	PB_TP	11.00	0.00
tblVehicleTrips	PR_TP	86.00	87.00
tblVehicleTrips	PR_TP	54.00	59.50

As you can see in the excerpt above, pass-by trips were reduced to zero and reallocated to primary and diverted trips in the model. According to the "User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data" table, the justification provided for these changes is: "Pass-by trips changed to 0 and pass-by trips split btwn primary and divert" (Appendix B, pp. 78, 110, 143). We can reasonably assume that the pass-by trips were reduced to zero because the 11,352 daily trips calculated by the model already include pass-by trips (Appendix I, pp. 43, Table 4-3). However, just because the percentage of pass-by trips is reduced to zero does not guarantee that the number of diverted trips would increase. Thus, the model should have reallocated all pass-by trips to primary, unless an updated EIR can prove that the percentage of diverted trips will increase. As a result, the model may underestimate emissions and should not be relied upon to determine Project significance.

Unsubstantiated Application of Mobile-Related Mitigation Measure

Review of the Project's CalEEMod output files demonstrates that the model includes the following mobile mitigation measures: "Increase Density," "Increase Diversity," "Improve Destination Accessibility," "Increase Transit Accessibility," and "Improve Pedestrian Network" (see excerpt below) (Appendix B, pp. 101, 133, 167).

8.71

8.72

⁴ "CalEEMod User's Guide, Appendix A: Calculation Details for CalEEMod." *SCAQMD*, *available at:* <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/caleemod-appendixa.pdf?sfvrsn=2</u>, p. 20

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

Increase Density	
Increase Diversity	
Improve Destination Accessibility	
Increase Transit Accessibility	
Improve Pedestrian Network	

As previously mentioned, the CalEEMod User's Guide requires any changes to model defaults be justified.⁵ Review of the "User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data" table demonstrates that the justification provided for these mitigation measures is:

"~3.77 miles NE downtown Menifee & ~0.07 miles E RTA Rte 27 stop Hwy 74 at Palomar.
Sidewalks on/off-site. 637DU/24.16ac=26.37DU/ac. 1emp/500sf com retail = 246,312sf/500sf = 8.73
~493emp/18.85ac= 26.2emp/ac. LUT-3 mixed residential/commercial" (Appendix B, pp. 78, 110, 143).

However, neither this justification nor the DEIR provide sufficient substantiation for the inclusion of these mitigation measures. Therefore, we cannot verify the use of these measures in the model and it should not be relied upon to determine Project significance.

Unsubstantiated Application of Waste-Related Mitigation Measure

Review of the Project's CalEEMod output files demonstrates that the model includes the "Institute Recycling & Composting Services" waste-related operational mitigation measure (see excerpt below) (Appendix B, pp. 108, 140, 177).

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

Institute Recycling and Composting Services

As previously mentioned, the CalEEMod User's Guide requires any changes to model defaults be justified.⁶ Regarding a waste reduction strategy, the "User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data" table states that "AB 341 requires at least 75% of waste be diverted from landfills by 2020" (Appendix B, pp. 78, 110, 143). Furthermore, the Standard Conditions and Mitigation Measures portion of the DEIR states,

"SC-USS-4 Solid Waste. The Project applicant shall comply with the requirements of AB 939 ("California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989") and AB 341 (which amends and clarifies portions of 939), which requires waste diversion mandates. During construction and 8.74

I

⁵ CalEEMod User Guide, available at: <u>http://www.caleemod.com/</u>, p. 2, 9

⁶ CalEEMod User Guide, available at: <u>http://www.caleemod.com/</u>, p. 2, 9

operation, the applicant shall achieve diversion of 50 percent of all solid waste through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities" (p. 4.16-50).

However, review of the CalEEMod output files demonstrates that the model includes a 75% reduction in waste-related emissions (Appendix B, pp. 147-148). This is unsubstantiated, as the DEIR only commits to the diversion of 50% of the Project's solid waste. The DEIR points out that AB 341 has a target of a 75% reduction statewide by 2020 (p. 4.5-16, Table 4.5-6). However, it fails to indicate that this applies at the project-level or that this goal is actually being achieved and will result in reductions beyond 2020, as the Project will not become operational until 2022. Thus, as the DEIR fails to justify the inclusion of a reduction of waste-related emissions beyond 50%, the model may underestimate emissions and should not be relied upon to determine Project significance.

Failure to Implement All Feasible Mitigation to Reduce Emissions

The DEIR determines that the Project's NO_x emissions will result in a "significant and unavoidable" air quality impact (p. 4.3-23). However, while we agree that the Project would result in a significant NO_x impact, the DEIR's conclusion that these impacts are "significant and unavoidable" is incorrect. According to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA),

"CEQA requires Lead Agencies to mitigate or avoid significant environmental impacts associated with discretionary projects. Environmental documents for projects that have any significant environmental impacts must identify all feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce the impacts below a level of significance. If after the identification of all feasible mitigation measures, a project is still deemed to have significant environmental impacts, the Lead Agency can approve a project, but must adopt a Statement of Overriding Consideration to explain why further mitigation measures are not feasible and why approval of a project with significant unavoidable impacts is warranted."⁷

As you can see, an impact can only be labeled as significant and unavoidable after all available, feasible mitigation is considered. Review of the Project's proposed mitigation measures, however, demonstrates that not all feasible mitigation measures are being implemented. Therefore, the DEIR's conclusion that impacts are significant and unavoidable is unsubstantiated. As a result, additional mitigation measures should be identified and incorporated in an updated EIR in order to reduce the Project's air quality impacts to the maximum extent possible. Until all feasible mitigation is reviewed and incorporated into the Project's design, impacts from NO_x emissions cannot be considered significant and unavoidable.⁸

Diesel Particulate Matter Health Risk Emissions Inadequately Evaluated

The DEIR concludes that the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on the health of sensitive receptors near the Project site without conducting a quantitative health risk assessment (HRA) for Project's entire construction and operation (p. 4.3-32).

8.75 cont.

8.76

8.77

5

⁷ http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI-2015/FINAL-DRAFT-GAMAQI.PDF, p. 115 of 125

⁸ See section titled "Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Operational Emissions" on p. 19 of this comment letter. These measures would effectively reduce operational NOx emissions.

The DEIR fails to conduct a quantified HRA for construction and instead relies upon a Localized Significance Threshold (LST) analysis, which found that Project construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD LSTs. Regarding construction-related health risks, the DEIR states,

"**Table 4.3-15**, *Localized Construction Emissions* illustrates the construction related localized emissions and compares the results to SCAQMD LST thresholds. As shown in **Table 4.3-15**, the emissions will be below the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for localized construction emissions...The Project's short-term construction impact to localized air resources is less than significance" (p. 4.3-32 – 4.3-33).

Regarding operational health risk impacts, the DEIR attempts to justify its significance determination by stating,

"According to SCAQMD LST methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a project, if the project includes stationary sources, or attracts mobile sources (such as heavy-duty trucks) that may spend long periods queuing and idling at the site; such as industrial warehouse/transfer facilities. The proposed Project is a mixed-use project consisting of residential and commercial uses and does not include such uses. Therefore, due the lack of stationary source emissions, no long-term localized threshold analysis is warranted. The Project will result in less than significant localized operational emissions impacts" (p. 4.3-34).

The DEIR goes on to state,

"Based on the above, ultra-conservative assumptions, Table 9 shows that the 30.25-year, cumulative carcinogenic health risk (3rd trimester [-0.25 to 0 years] + infant [0-2 years] + child [2-16 years] + adult [16-30 years]) to an individual born during the opening year of the project, and located in the project vicinity for the entire 30-year duration, is a maximum of 3.9 in a million" (p. Health Risk Assessment, p. 19).

The excerpts above demonstrate the DEIR's attempts to evaluate the Project's health risk impact without conducting a quantified construction HRA. The failure to quantify the health risk posed to nearby sensitive receptors from exposure to toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions released during Project activities is incorrect for several reasons.

First, the use of the LST method to determine the Projects health risk impacts on nearby, existing sensitive receptors is incorrect. While the LST method assesses the impact of pollutants at a local level, it only evaluates impacts from criteria air pollutants. According to the Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology document prepared by the SCAQMD, the LST analysis is only applicable to NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions, which are collectively referred to as criteria air pollutants.⁹ Because the LST method can only be applied to criteria air pollutants, this method cannot be used to determine whether emissions from DPM, a known human carcinogen, will result in a significant health risk impact

8.78

8.80

8.79

⁹ "Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology." SCAQMD, Revised July 2008, *available at:* <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/final-lst-methodology-document.pdf.</u>

to nearby sensitive receptors. As a result, health impacts from exposure to toxic air contaminants (TACs), such as diesel particulate matter (DPM), were not analyzed, thus leaving a gap within the DEIR's analysis.

Second, the omission of a quantified HRA is inconsistent with the most recent guidance published by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the organization responsible for providing guidance on conducting HRAs in California. In February of 2015, OEHHA released its most recent Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments, as cited in the DEIR (Health Risk Assessment, p. 11).¹⁰ This guidance document describes the types of projects that warrant the preparation of an HRA. Construction of the Project will produce emissions of DPM, a human carcinogen, through the exhaust stacks of construction equipment over a construction period of approximately three-years and seven months (Appendix B, pp. 83). The OEHHA document recommends that all short-term projects lasting at least two months be evaluated for cancer risks to nearby sensitive receptors.¹¹ Therefore, per OEHHA guidelines, health risk impacts from Project construction should have been evaluated by the DEIR. Furthermore, once construction of the Project is complete, the Project will operate for a long period of time. As previously stated, Project operation will generate approximately 11,352 daily vehicle trips, which will generate additional exhaust emissions and continue to expose nearby sensitive receptors to DPM emissions (p. 5-20, Table 5-2). The OEHHA document recommends that exposure from projects lasting more than 6 months be evaluated for the duration of the project, and recommends that an exposure duration of 30 years be used to estimate individual cancer risk for the maximally exposed individual resident (MEIR).¹² Even though we were not provided with the expected lifetime of the Project, we can reasonably assume that the Project will operate for at least 30 years, if not more. Therefore, health risks from Project operation should have also been evaluated by the DEIR, as a 30-year exposure duration vastly exceeds the 2-month and 6-month requirements set forth by OEHHA. These recommendations reflect the most recent health risk policy, and as such, an updated assessment of health risks to nearby sensitive receptors from Project construction and operation should be included in a revised CEQA evaluation for the Project.

Third, by claiming a less than significant impact without conducting a quantified HRA to nearby, existing sensitive receptors as a result of Project construction, the DEIR fails to compare the excess health risk to the SCAQMD's specific numeric threshold of 10 in one million.¹³ Thus, the DEIR cannot conclude less than significant health risk impacts resulting from Project construction without quantifying emissions to compare to the proper threshold.

8.83

8.81 cont.

¹⁰ "Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, *available at:* <u>http://oehha.ca.gov/air/hot_spots/hotspots2015.html</u>

¹¹ "Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, available at: <u>http://oehha.ca.gov/air/hot_spots/2015/2015GuidanceManual.pdf</u>, p. 8-18

¹² "Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, available at: <u>http://oehha.ca.gov/air/hot_spots/2015/2015GuidanceManual.pdf</u>, p. 8-6, 8-15

¹³ "South Coast AQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds." SCAQMD, April 2019, *available at:* <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf?sfvrsn=2</u>

Regarding Project operations, the DEIR conducted an HRA for the increased cancer risk due to operational mobile emissions. However, the HRA failed to include the Project's *entire* operational emissions. According to the CalEEMod User's Guide, a Project's operational emissions include the following sources: on-road mobile vehicle traffic, fugitive dust associated with roads, architectural coating activities, off-road equipment used during operation, landscaping equipment, emergency generators, fire pumps, process boilers, consumer products, parking lot degreasers, fertilizers/pesticides, cleaning supplies, wood stoves and hearth usage, electricity usage in buildings, electricity usage from lighting in parking lots and lighting, ventilation and elevators for parking, water usage, and solid waste disposal.¹⁴ By only conducting an HRA for the Project's operational *mobile emissions*, the model underestimates the Project's operational emissions and excess cancer risk to nearby sensitive receptors. Thus, the DEIR cannot conclude less than significant health risk impacts resulting from Project operation without quantifying emissions and the excess cancer risk to nearby sensitive receptors resulting from the Project's entire operational emissions.

Finally, while the DEIR calculated the health risk to nearby, existing third trimester, infant, child, and adult receptors for diesel truck traffic emissions, the HRA fails to evaluate the cumulative lifetime cancer risk to nearby, existing receptors as a result of Project construction *and* operation together, including all aspects of the proposed Project. This is incorrect and, as a result, the DEIR's evaluation and significance conclusion cannot be relied upon. OEHHA guidance requires that the excess cancer risk be calculated separately for all sensitive receptor age bins, then summed to evaluate the <u>total</u> cancer risk posed by <u>all</u> <u>Project activities</u>. Therefore, the DEIR should have quantified the Project's *entire* construction and operational health risk impacts, as well as compared the combined construction and operational health risk impacts to the SCAQMD threshold of ten in one million. To determine the correct excess cancer risk associated with the Project's *entire* construction and operational DPM, we will prepare a screening-level health risk assessment and suggest mitigation if necessary.

Screening-Level Assessment Indicates Significant Impact

In an effort to demonstrate the potential risk posed by Project construction and all Project operation to nearby sensitive receptors, we prepared a simple screening-level HRA. The results of our assessment, as described below, provide substantial evidence that the Project's construction and operational DPM emissions may result in a potentially significant health risk impact not previously identified by the DEIR.

In order to conduct our screening level risk assessment, we relied upon AERSCREEN, which is a screening level air quality dispersion model. ¹⁵ The model replaced SCREEN3, and AERSCREEN is included in the OEHHA¹⁶ and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Associated (CAPCOA)¹⁷ guidance as the appropriate air dispersion model for Level 2 health risk screening assessments ("HRSAs"). A Level 2 HRSA

8.86

8.87

8.85

 ¹⁴ "CalEEMod User's Guide." CAPCOA, November 2017, *available at:* <u>http://www.caleemod.com/</u>, p. 2.
 ¹⁵ "AERSCREEN Released as the EPA Recommended Screening Model," USEPA, April 11, 2011, *available at:* <u>http://www.epa.gov/ttn/scram/guidance/clarification/20110411</u> AERSCREEN Release Memo.pdf

¹⁶ "Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, *available at:* <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf</u>

¹⁷ "Health Risk Assessments for Proposed Land Use Projects," CAPCOA, July 2009, *available at:* <u>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/CAPCOA_HRA_LU_Guidelines_8-6-09.pdf</u>

utilizes a limited amount of site-specific information to generate maximum reasonable downwind concentrations of air contaminants to which nearby sensitive receptors may be exposed. If an unacceptable air quality hazard is determined to be possible using AERSCREEN, a more refined modeling approach is required prior to approval of the Project.

We prepared a preliminary HRA of the Project's construction and operational health-related impact to residential sensitive receptors using the annual PM₁₀ exhaust estimates from the SWAPE annual CalEEMod output files. According to the DEIR, there is a sensitive receptor located approximately 300 feet, or roughly 91 meters, north of the Project site (p. 4.3-34). Consistent with recommendations set forth by OEHHA, we assumed residential exposure begins during the third trimester stage of life. The Project's construction CalEEMod output files indicate that construction activities will generate approximately 395 pounds of diesel particulate matter (DPM). 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 Project construction, we calculated an average DPM emission rate by the following equation:

$$Emission Rate \left(\frac{grams}{second}\right) = \frac{394.8 \, lbs}{604 \, days} \times \frac{453.6 \, grams}{lbs} \times \frac{1 \, day}{24 \, hours} \times \frac{1 \, hour}{3,600 \, seconds} = 0.003432 \, g/s$$

Using this equation, we estimated a construction emission rate of 0.003432 grams per second (g/s). Subtracting the 604-day construction duration from the total residential duration of 30 years, we assumed that after Project construction the MEIR would be exposed to the Project's operational DPM for an additional 28.35 years, approximately. The Project's operational CalEEMod emissions indicate that operational activities will generate approximately 353 pounds of DPM per year throughout operation. Applying the same equation used to estimate the construction DPM rate, we estimated the following emission rate for Project operation:

$$Emission Rate \left(\frac{grams}{second}\right) = \frac{353 \ lbs}{365 \ days} \times \frac{453.6 \ grams}{lbs} \times \frac{1 \ day}{24 \ hours} \times \frac{1 \ hour}{3,600 \ seconds} = 0.00508 \ g/s$$

Using this equation, we estimated an operational emission rate of 0.00508 g/s. Construction and operational activity was simulated as a 43-acre rectangular area source in AERSCREEN with dimensions of 498 meters by 350 meters. A release height of three meters was selected to represent the height of exhaust stacks on 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 AERSCREEN model generates maximum reasonable estimates of single-hour DPM concentrations from the Project site. EPA guidance suggests that in screening procedures, the annualized average concentration of an air pollutant be estimated by multiplying the single-hour concentration by 10%.¹⁸ AS

8.89

8.87

cont.

¹⁸ "Screening Procedures for Estimating the Air Quality Impact of Stationary Sources Revised." EPA, 1992, *available at*: <u>http://www.epa.gov/ttn/scram/guidance/guide/EPA-454R-92-019_OCR.pdf</u>; *see also* "Risk Assessment

previously stated, there are residential sensitive receptors located approximately 100 meters from the Project site. The single-hour concentration estimated by AERSCREEN for Project construction is approximately 0.9049 μ g/m³ DPM at approximately 100 meters downwind. Multiplying this single-hour concentration by 10%, we get an annualized average concentration of 0.09049 μ g/m³ for Project construction at the maximally exposed sensitive receptor listed in the DEIR. For Project operation, the single-hour concentration is estimated by AERSCREEN is approximately 1.339 μ g/m³ at approximately 100 meters downwind. Multiplying this single-hour concentration by 10%, we get an annualized average concentration by 1.339 μ g/m³ at approximately 1.00 meters downwind. Multiplying this single-hour concentration by 10%, we get an annualized average concentration by 10%, we get an annualized average is approximately 1.339 μ g/m³ at approximately 1.00 meters downwind. Multiplying this single-hour concentration by 10%, we get an annualized average concentration of 0.1339 μ g/m³ for Project operation at the maximally exposed sensitive receptor listed in the DEIR.

We calculated the excess cancer risk to the residential receptors both maximally exposed and located closest to the Project site using applicable HRA methodologies prescribed by OEHHA and the SCAQMD, as referenced by the DEIR (Health Risk Assessment, p. 11). Consistent with the construction schedule proposed by the DEIR, the annualized average concentration for construction was used for the entire third trimester of pregnancy (0.25 years) and for 1.45 years of the infantile stage of life (0 – 2 years). The annualized average concentration for operation was used for the remainder of the 30-year exposure period, including the remaining infantile stage of life, child stage of life (2 – 16 years), and adult stage of life (16 – 30 years).

Consistent with OEHHA guidance, as cited by the DEIR, and SCAQMD guidance, we used Age Sensitivity Factors (ASFs) to account for the heightened susceptibility of young children to the carcinogenic toxicity of air pollution (Health Risk Assessment, p. 11).^{19, 20} According to the most updated guidance, quantified cancer risk should be multiplied by a factor of ten during the third trimester of pregnancy and during the first two years of life (infant) and should be multiplied by a factor of three during the child stage of life (2 to 16 years). Furthermore, in accordance with the OEHHA guidance, we used the 95th percentile breathing rates for infants.²¹ We used a cancer potency factor of 1.1 (mg/kg-day)⁻¹ and an averaging time of 25,550 days. OEHHA recommends that a 30-year exposure duration be used as the basis for estimating cancer risk at the maximally exposed receptor included in the DEIR.²² Also consistent with OEHHA guidance, exposure to the receptor was assumed to begin in the third trimester to provide the most conservative estimate of air quality hazards. Finally, according to SCAQMD guidance, we used a 8.89 cont.

Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, available at: <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf</u>, p. 4-36

¹⁹ "Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, *available at:* <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf</u>.

²⁰ "Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Proposed The Exchange (SCH No. 2018071058)." SCAQMD, March 2019, *available at:* <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/comment-</u> letters/2019/march/RVC190115-03.pdf?sfvrsn=8, p. 4.

²¹ "Supplemental Guidelines for Preparing Risk Assessments for the Air Toxics 'Hot Spots' Information and Assessment Act," June 5, 2015, *available at:* <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/risk-assessment/ab2588-risk-assessment-guidelines.pdf?sfvrsn=6</u>, p. 19.

[&]quot;Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, available at: <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf</u>

²²"Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for preparation of Health Risk Assessments." OEHHA, February 2015, available at: <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf</u>, p. 8-6.

Fraction of Time At Home (FAH) Value of 1 for the 3rd trimester and infant receptors and 0.73 for adult receptors.²³ The results of our calculations are shown below.

Activity	Duration (years)	Concentration (ug/m3)	Breathing Rate (L/kg- day)	ASF	Cancer Risk with ASFs*
Construction	0.25	0.09049	361	10	1.2E-06
3rd Trimester Duration	0.25			3rd Trimester Exposure	1.2E-06
Construction	1.40	0.09049	1090	10	2.1E-05
Operation	0.60	0.1339	1090	10	1.3E-05
Infant Exposure Duration	2.00			Infant Exposure	3.4E-05
Operation	14.00	0.1339	572	3	4.8E-05
Child Exposure Duration	14.00			Child Exposure	4.8E-05
Operation	14.00	0.1339	261	1	5.4E-06
Adult Exposure Duration	14.00			Adult Exposure	5.4E-06
Lifetime Exposure Duration	30.00			Lifetime Exposure	8.9E-05

The Maximally Exposed Individual at an Existing Residential Receptor

As indicated in the table above, the excess cancer risk posed to adults, children, infants, and during the third trimester of pregnancy at the maximally exposed sensitive receptor indicated in the DEIR, located approximately 100 meters away, over the course of Project construction and operation are approximately 5.4, 48, 34, and 1.2 in one million, respectively. The excess cancer risk over the course of a residential lifetime (30 years) at the maximally exposed sensitive receptor indicated in the DEIR is approximately 89 in one million. The child, infant, and lifetime cancer risks exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 10 in one million, thus resulting in a potentially significant health risk impact not previously identified or addressed by the DEIR.

An agency must include an analysis of health risks that connects the Project's air emissions with the health risk posed by those emissions. Our analysis represents a screening-level HRA, which is known to be conservative and tends to err on the side of health protection. The purpose of the screening-level construction HRA shown above is to demonstrate the link between the proposed Project's emissions and the potential health risk. Our screening-level HRA demonstrates that construction of the Project could result in a potentially significant health risk impact, when correct exposure assumptions and up-

8.91 cont.

²³ "Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401, 1401.1, and 212." SCAQMD, August 2017, *available at:* <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/Proposed-</u> Rules/1401/riskassessmentprocedures 2017 080717.pdf, p. 7.

to-date, applicable guidance are used. Therefore, since our screening-level construction HRA indicates a potentially significant impact, an updated CEQA analysis should include a reasonable effort to connect the Project's air quality emissions and the potential health risks posed to nearby receptors. Thus, an updated CEQA analysis should include a quantified air pollution model as well as an updated, quantified refined health risk assessment which adequately and accurately evaluates health risk impacts associated with both Project construction and operation.

Greenhouse Gas

Failure to Adequately Evaluate Greenhouse Gas Impacts

The DEIR concludes that the Project would have a less than significant GHG impact based on an interpolated service population threshold. Specifically, the DEIR states:

"The Project has been compared to the SCAQMD tier 4 interpolated 2023 target service population threshold of 4.44 MTCO2e per specific plan per year (The Tier 4 2023 threshold was interpolated from the SCAQMD Tier 4 2020 Target Service Population Threshold of 4.8 MTCO₂e/year/SP and the 2035 Target Service Population Threshold of 3.0 MTCO₂e/year/SP), based on Compliance Option 3... With implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-GHG-1 through Mitigation Measure MMGHG-7, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level" (p. 4.5-13, 4.5-14).

Furthermore, the DEIR evaluates the Project's consistency with the CARB Scoping Plan and reduction measures in the City of Menifee's General Plan EIR in order to determine the significance of the Project's GHG impact (p. 4.5-14 - 4.5-21).

However, the DEIR's analysis is incorrect for three reasons:

- (1) CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan is not a CAP;
- (2) Incorrect and unsubstantiated analysis indicates potentially significant impacts; and,
- (3) Updated analysis demonstrates significant impacts not previously identified in the DEIR.

(1) The 2017 CARB Scoping Plan and Menifee's General Plan EIR are not CAPs

The DEIR relies upon CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan and Menifee's General Plan EIR to determine Project significance. However, the 2017 CARB Scoping Plan and City of Menifee's General Plan EIR do not qualify as Climate Action Plan (CAPs). CEQA Guidelines § 15064.4(b)(3) allows a lead agency to consider "[t]he extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions (*see, e.g., section 15183.5(b)*)." (Emph. added). When adopting this language, the California Natural Resources Agency ("Resources Agency") explained in its 2018 Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action ("2018 Statement of Reason")²⁴ that it explicitly added referenced to section 15183.5(b) because it was "needed to clarify that lead agencies may rely on plans *prepared pursuant to section 15183.5* in evaluating a project's [GHG] emissions ... [and] consistent with the Agency's Final Statement of Reasons

cont.

8.93

8.94

²⁴ Resources Agency (Nov. 2018) Final Statement of Reasons For Regulatory Action: Amendments To The State CEQA Guidelines, <u>http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/2018 CEQA Final Statement of%20Reasons 111218.pdf</u>.

for the addition of section 15064.4, which states that 'proposed section 15064.4 is intended to be <u>read</u> <u>in conjunction with . . . proposed section 15183.5</u>. Those sections each indicate that local and regional plans may be developed to reduce GHG emissions.'" 2018 Final Statement of Reason, p. 19 (emph. added); see also 2009 Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action, p. 27.²⁵ When read in conjunction, CEQA Guidelines §§ 15064.4(b)(3) and 15183.5(b)(1) make clear qualified GHG reduction plans (also commonly referred to as a Climate Action Plan ["CAP"]) should include the following features:

- (1) **Inventory**: Quantify GHG emissions, both existing and projected over a specified time period, resulting from activities (e.g., projects) within a defined geographic area (e.g., lead agency jurisdiction);
- (2) Establish GHG Reduction Goal: Establish a level, based on substantial evidence, below which the contribution to GHG emissions from activities covered by the plan would not be cumulatively considerable;
- (3) **Analyze Project Types**: Identify and analyze the GHG emissions resulting from specific actions or categories of actions anticipated within the geographic area;
- (4) **Craft Performance Based Mitigation Measures**: Specify measures or a group of measures, including performance standards, that substantial evidence demonstrates, if implemented on a project-by-project basis, would collectively achieve the specified emissions level;
- (5) **Monitoring**: Establish a mechanism to monitor the CAP progress toward achieving said level and to require amendment if the plan is not achieving specified levels;

The above-listed CAP features provide the necessary <u>substantial evidence demonstrating a project's</u> <u>incremental contribution is not cumulative considerable</u>, as required under CEQA Guidelines § 15064.4(b)(3).²⁶ Here, however, the DEIR fails to demonstrate that the 2017 CARB Scoping Plan and City of Menifee's General Plan EIR include the above-listed requirements to be considered a qualified CAP for the City. As such, the DEIR leaves an analytical gap showing that compliance with said plans can be used for a project-level significance determination. Thus, the DEIR's GHG analysis regarding the 2017 CARB Scoping Plan and City of Menifee's General Plan EIR should not be relied upon to determine Project significance.

(2) The DEIR's Incorrect and Unsubstantiated Analysis Indicates a Potentially Significant GHG Impact 8.96 cont.

²⁵ Resources Agency (Dec. 2009) Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action, p. 27 ("Those sections each indicate that local and regional plans may be developed to reduce GHG emissions. If such plans reduce community-wide emissions to a level that is less than significant, a later project that complies with the requirements in such a plan may be found to have a less than significant impact."), <u>http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/</u> docs/Final_Statement_of_Reasons.pdf.

²⁶ See Mission Bay Alliance v. Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure (2016) 6 Cal.App.5th 160, 200-201 (Upheld qualitative GHG analysis when based on city's adopted its greenhouse gas strategy that contained "multiple elements" of CEQA Guidelines § 15183.5(b), "quantification of [city's] baseline levels of [GHG] emissions and planned reductions[,]" approved by the regional air district, and "[a]t the heart" of the city's greenhouse gas strategy was "specific regulations" and measures to be implemented on a "project-by-project basis … designed to achieve the specified citywide emission level.").

As discussed above, the DEIR concluded that the Project's emissions per service population, including Mitigation Measure MM GHG-1 through Mitigation Measure MM GHG-7, would be 4.3 MTCO₂e/service population/year (MTCO₂e/SP/yr) (p. 4.5-13). The DEIR concludes that, based on an interpolated tier 4 2023 target service population threshold of 4.44 MTCO₂e/SP/yr, the Project would have a less than significant GHG impact (p. 4.5-14). However, this conclusion is incorrect for two reasons.

First, the DEIR's GHG analysis relies on an incorrect and unsubstantiated air model, as previously discussed. This is incorrect, as the model underestimates the Project's GHG emissions.

Second, while we agree that the SCAQMD's 2020 bright-line threshold is not appropriate for evaluating the significance of the Project, which will be operational after 2020, the DEIR cannot simply make up its own adjusted threshold with which to compare emissions (Appendix B, pp. 83, 115, 149). The DEIR's adjusted threshold has not been reviewed or approved by the appropriate processes and the SCAQMD and thus, cannot be relied upon to determine Project significance. Rather, the SCAQMD does provide an updated Tier 4 service population efficiency target goal of 3.0 MTCO₂e/SP/year for target year 2035, as referenced by the DEIR.²⁷ Thus, the DEIR should have compared the Project's emissions to the SCAQMD 2035 target service population threshold of 3.0 MT CO₂e/SP/yr. When we compare the Project's purported per service population emissions of 4.3 MT CO₂e/SP/yr to the correct SCAQMD 2035 target service population threshold, we find a potentially significant GHG impact.

(3) Updated Analysis Indicates a Potentially Significant Impact

Applicable thresholds and site-specific modeling demonstrate that the Project may result in a potentially significant GHG impact. The updated CalEEMod output files, modeled by SWAPE with Project-specific information, disclose the Project's mitigated emissions, which include approximately 6,501.70 MT CO₂e of total construction emissions (sum of 2019, 2020, 2021, and 2022) and approximately 18,205.81 MT CO₂e/year of operational emissions (sum of area, energy, mobile, waste, and water-related emissions). When dividing the Project's GHG emissions (amortized construction + operational) by a service population value of 2,423, we find that the Project would emit approximately 7.60 MT CO₂e/SP/year (Appendix B, p. 7-2). This exceeds the SCAQMD 2035 efficiency threshold of 3.0 MT CO₂e/SP/year, as well as the unsubstantiated interpolated 2023 threshold of 4.43 MT CO₂e/SP/year and SCAQMD 2020 efficiency threshold of 4.8 MT CO₂e/SP/year (see table below).

²⁷ See SCAQMD (Dec. 5, 2008) Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans, http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgboardsynopsis.pdf?sfvrsn=2; see also SCAQMD (Oct. 2008) Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold, http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgattachmente.pdf; SCAQMD (Sep. 28, 2010) Minutes for the GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Stakeholder Working Group # 15,

8.98

8.99

8.100

http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significancethresholds/year-2008-2009/ghg-meeting-15/ghg-meeting-15-minutes.pdf.

DEIR Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions										
Project Phase	Proposed Project (MT CO₂e/year)									
Construction (amortized over 30 years)	216.72									
Area	149.50									
Energy	2588.74									
Mobile	14940.20									
Waste	138.71									
Water	388.66									
Total	18,422.53									
Service Population	2,423									
Service Population Efficiency	7.60									
Threshold	3.00									
Exceed?	Yes									

8.101 cont.

8.103

As the above table demonstrates, when correct input parameters are used to model Project emissions, the Project's GHG emissions exceed the SCAQMD's 2035 service population efficiency threshold of 3.0 MT CO₂e/SP/year, thus resulting in a significant impact not previously assessed or identified in the DEIR. As a result, an updated GHG analysis should be prepared in a Project-specific EIR and additional mitigation should be incorporated into the Project accordingly (see mitigation below).

Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Construction Emissions

Our analysis demonstrates that, when Project activities are modeled correctly, construction emissions may result in potentially significant impacts. Therefore, additional mitigation measures must be identified and incorporated in an updated EIR to reduce these emissions to a less than significant level.

Additional mitigation measures can be found in CAPCOA's Quantifying Greenhouse Gas MitigationMeasures, which attempt to reduce GHG levels, as well as reduce criteria air pollutants such asparticulate matter and NOx.²⁸ DPM and NOx are a byproduct of diesel fuel combustion and are emittedby on-road vehicles and by off-road construction equipment. Mitigation for criteria pollutant emissionsshould include consideration of the following measures in an effort to reduce construction emissions.²⁹

Require Implementation of Diesel Control Measures

The Northeast Diesel Collaborative (NEDC) is a regionally coordinated initiative to reduce diesel emissions, improve public health, and promote clean diesel technology. The NEDC recommends that contracts for all construction projects require the following diesel control measures: ³⁰

³⁰ Diesel Emission Controls in Construction Projects, *available*

²⁸<u>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf</u>

²⁹ For measures to reduce operational DPM emissions, see section titled "Additional Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Operational Emissions" on p. 25 of this letter. These measures would effectively reduce operational VOC and NOx emissions, DPM emissions, as well as GHG emissions.

at:http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/nedc-model-contract-sepcification.pdf

- All diesel generators on site for more than 10 total days must be equipped with emission control technology verified by EPA or CARB to reduce PM emissions by a minimum of 85 percent.
- All diesel vehicles, construction equipment, and generators on site shall be fueled with ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel (ULSD) or a biodiesel blend³¹ approved by the original engine manufacturer with sulfur content of 15 parts per million (ppm) or less.

Repower or Replace Older Construction Equipment Engines

The NEDC recognizes that availability of equipment that meets the EPA's newer standards is limited.³² Due to this limitation, the NEDC proposes actions that can be taken to reduce emissions from existing equipment in the *Best Practices for Clean Diesel Construction* report.³³ These actions include but are not limited to:

• Repowering equipment (i.e. replacing older engines with newer, cleaner engines and leaving the body of the equipment intact).

Engine repower may be a cost-effective emissions reduction strategy when a vehicle or machine has a long useful life and the cost of the engine does not approach the cost of the entire vehicle or machine. Examples of good potential replacement candidates include marine vessels, locomotives, and large construction machines.³⁴ Older diesel vehicles or machines can be repowered with newer diesel engines or in some cases with engines that operate on alternative fuels. The original engine is taken out of service and a new engine with reduced emission characteristics is installed. Significant emission reductions can be achieved, depending on the newer engine and the vehicle or machine's ability to accept a more modern engine and emission control system. It should be noted, however, that newer engines or higher tier engines are not necessarily cleaner engines, so it is important that the Project Applicant check the actual emission standard level of the current (existing) and new engines to ensure the repower product is reducing emissions for DPM.³⁵

• Replacement of older equipment with equipment meeting the latest emission standards.

Engine replacement can include substituting a cleaner highway engine for a nonroad engine. Diesel equipment may also be replaced with other technologies or fuels. Examples include hybrid switcher locomotives, electric cranes, LNG, CNG, LPG or propane yard tractors, forklifts or loaders. Replacements using natural gas may require changes to fueling infrastructure.³⁶ Replacements often

http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/verdev/reg/biodieselcompliance.pdf

8.107

8.106

8.105

cont.

³¹ Biodiesel lends are only to be used in conjunction with the technologies which have been verified for use with biodiesel blends and are subject to the following requirements:

³²http://northeastdiesel.org/pdf/BestPractices4CleanDieselConstructionAug2012.pdf

³³http://northeastdiesel.org/pdf/BestPractices4CleanDieselConstructionAug2012.pdf

³⁴ Repair, Rebuild, and Repower, EPA, *available at:<u>https://www.epa.gov/verified-diesel-tech/learn-about-verified-technologies-clean-diesel#repair</u>*

³⁵ Diesel Emissions Reduction Program (DERA): Technologies, Fleets and Projects Information, *available at*:<u>http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/420p11001.pdf</u>

³⁶ Alternative Fuel Conversion, EPA, *available at:*

https://www3.epa.gov/otaq/consumer/fuels/altfuels.htm#fact

require some re-engineering work due to differences in size and configuration. Typically, there are benefits in fuel efficiency, reliability, warranty, and maintenance costs.³⁷

Install Retrofit Devices on Existing Construction Equipment

PM emissions from alternatively-fueled construction equipment can be further reduced by installing retrofit devices on existing and/or new equipment. The most common retrofit technologies are retrofit devices for engine exhaust after-treatment. These devices are installed in the exhaust system to reduce emissions and should not impact engine or vehicle operation. ³⁸ It should be noted that actual emissions reductions and costs will depend on specific manufacturers, technologies and applications.

Use Electric and Hybrid Construction Equipment

CAPCOA's *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*³⁹ report also proposes the use of electric and/or hybrid construction equipment as a way to mitigate DPM emissions. When construction equipment is powered by grid electricity rather than fossil fuel, direct emissions from fuel combustion are replaced with indirect emissions associated with the electricity used to power the equipment. Furthermore, when construction equipment is powered by hybrid-electric drives, emissions from fuel combustion are also greatly reduced. Electric construction equipment is available commercially from companies such as Peterson Pacific Corporation,⁴⁰ which specialize in the mechanical processing equipment like grinders and shredders. Construction equipment powered by hybrid-electric drives is also commercially available from companies such as Caterpillar.⁴¹ For example, Caterpillar reports that during an 8-hour shift, its D7E hybrid dozer burns 19.5 percent fewer gallons of fuel than a conventional dozer while achieving a 10.3 percent increase in productivity. The D7E model burns 6.2 gallons per hour compared to a conventional dozer which burns 7.7 gallons per hour.⁴² Fuel usage and savings are dependent on the make and model of the construction equipment used. The Project Applicant should calculate project-specific savings and provide manufacturer specifications indicating fuel burned per hour.

Implement a Construction Vehicle Inventory Tracking System

CAPCOA's *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*⁴³ report recommends that the Project Applicant provide a detailed plan that discusses a construction vehicle inventory tracking system to ensure compliances with construction mitigation measures. The system should include strategies such as requiring engine run time meters on equipment, documenting the serial number, horsepower, manufacture age, fuel, etc. of all onsite equipment and daily logging of the operating hours of the

content/uploads/peterson_electric_grinders1.pdf

17

8.109

³⁷ Cleaner Fuels, EPA, *available at:*<u>https://www.epa.gov/verified-diesel-tech/learn-about-verified-technologies-</u> <u>clean-diesel#cleaner</u>

³⁸ Retrofit Technologies, EPA, *available at:*<u>https://www.epa.gov/verified-diesel-tech/learn-about-verified-technologies-clean-diesel#retrofit</u>

 ³⁹<u>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf</u>
 ⁴⁰ Peterson Electric Grinders Brochure, *available at:<u>http://www.petersoncorp.com/wp-</u>*

⁴¹ Electric Power Products, available at:<u>http://www.cat.com/en_US/products/new/power-systems/electric-power-generation.html</u>

⁴²http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf

⁴³<u>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf</u>

equipment. Specifically, for each onroad construction vehicle, nonroad construction equipment, or generator, the contractor should submit to the developer's representative a report prior to bringing said equipment on site that includes:⁴⁴

- Equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment serial number, engine manufacturer, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, and engine serial number.
- The type of emission control technology installed, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, and EPA/CARB verification number/level.
- The Certification Statement⁴⁵ signed and printed on the contractor's letterhead.

Furthermore, the contractor should submit to the developer's representative a monthly report that, for each on-road construction vehicle, nonroad construction equipment, or generator onsite, includes: ⁴⁶

- Hour-meter readings on arrival on-site, the first and last day of every month, and on off-site date.
- Any problems with the equipment or emission controls.
- Certified copies of fuel deliveries for the time period that identify:
 - Source of supply
 - o Quantity of fuel
 - Quality of fuel, including sulfur content (percent by weight)

In addition to these measures, we also recommend that the Project implement the following mitigation measures, called "Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices,"⁴⁷ that are recommended by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD):

- 1. The project representative shall submit to the lead agency a comprehensive inventory of all offroad construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction project.
 - The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine model year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment.
 - The project representative shall provide the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman.
 - This information shall be submitted at least 4 business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment.
 - The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs.

8.112

8.110 cont.

⁴⁴ Diesel Emission Controls in Construction Projects, *available*

at:<u>http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/nedc-model-contract-sepcification.pdf</u> ⁴⁵ Diesel Emission Controls in Construction Projects, *available*

at:<u>http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/nedc-model-contract-sepcification.pdf</u> The NEDC Model Certification Statement can be found in Appendix A.

⁴⁶ Diesel Emission Controls in Construction Projects, *available*

at:http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/nedc-model-contract-sepcification.pdf

⁴⁷http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/Ch3EnhancedExhaustControl 10-2013.pdf

- 2. The project representative shall provide a plan for approval by the lead agency demonstrating that the heavy-duty off-road vehicles (50 horsepower or more) to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20% NOX reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent California Air Resources Board (ARB) fleet average.
 - This plan shall be submitted in conjunction with the equipment inventory.
 - Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, lowemission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.
 - The District's Construction Mitigation Calculator can be used to identify an equipment fleet that achieves this reduction.
- 3. The project representative shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel-powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40% opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour.
 - Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately. Non-compliant equipment will be documented and a summary provided to the lead agency monthly.
 - A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly.
 - A monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey.
- 4. The District and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this mitigation shall supersede other District, state or federal rules or regulations.

Use of Spray Equipment with Greater Transfer Efficiencies

Various coatings and adhesives are required to be applied by specified methods such as electrostatic spray, high-volume, low-pressure (HVLP) spray, roll coater, flow coater, dip coater, etc. in order to maximize the transfer efficiency. Transfer efficiency is typically defined as the ratio of the weight of coating solids adhering to an object to the total weight of coating solids used in the application process, expressed as a percentage. When it comes to spray applications, the rules typically require the use of either electrostatic spray equipment or HVLP spray equipment. The SCAQMD is now able to certify HVLP spray applicators and other application technologies at efficiency rates of 65 percent or greater.⁴⁸

These measures offer a cost-effective, feasible way to incorporate lower-emitting equipment into the Project's construction fleet, which subsequently reduces construction emissions. A revised EIR must be prepared to include additional mitigation measures, as well as include an updated air quality assessment to ensure that the necessary mitigation measures are implemented to reduce construction emissions. Furthermore, the updated EIR needs to demonstrate commitment to the implementation of these

8.112 cont.

⁴⁸ <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/home/permits/spray-equipment-transfer-efficiency</u>

measures prior to Project approval to ensure that the Project's construction-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent possible.

Feasible Mitigation Measures Available to Reduce Operational Emissions

As discussed above, the Project's operational NO_x and GHG emissions may result in a potentially significant impact. In an effort to reduce the Project's emissions, we identified several mitigation measures that are applicable to the Project. Feasible mitigation measures can be found in CAPCOA's *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*, which attempt to reduce GHG levels, as well as reduce criteria air pollutants.⁴⁹ Therefore, to reduce the Project's emissions, consideration of the following measures should be made.

- Energy-related mitigation:
 - Install programmable thermostat timers
 - Establish onsite renewable energy systems, including wind power
 - Limit outdoor lighting requirements
 - Reduce unnecessary outdoor lighting by utilizing design features such as limiting the hours of operation of outdoor lighting.
 - Provide education on energy efficiency to residents, customers, and/or tenants. Provide information on energy management services for large energy users.
 - Meet "reach" goals for building energy efficiency and renewable energy use.
 - Limit the use of outdoor lighting to only that needed for safety and security purposes.
 - Require use of electric or alternatively fueled sweepers with HEPA filters.
 - Include energy storage where appropriate to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.
 - Prohibit gas powered landscape equipment and implement electric yard equipment compatibility
- Transportation-related mitigation:
 - Provide EV parking
 - Require residential area parking permits
 - Implement ride-sharing, vanpool, shuttle, bike-sharing programs
 - Provide local shuttles
 - Implement area or cordon pricing
 - Install a park-and-ride lot
- Water-related mitigation:
 - Install an infiltration basin to provide an opportunity for 100% of the storm water to infiltrate on-site.
 - Install a system to reutilize gray water
 - Use locally-sourced water supply
 - Plant native and drought-resistant trees and vegetation

⁴⁹ "Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures." CAPCOA, Aug. 2010, <u>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf</u>, p. 433.

- Develop and follow a "green streets guide" that requires:

 Use of minimal amounts of concrete and asphalt;
 Use of groundcovers rather than pavement to reduce heat reflection.⁵⁰

 Implement Project design features such as:

 Shade HVAC equipment from direct sunlight;
 Install high-albedo white thermoplastic polyolefin roof membrane;
 Install formaldehyde-free insulation; and
 Use recycled-content gypsum board.
 - Require all buildings to become "LEED" and "WELL" certified.
 - Plant low-VOC emitting shade trees, e.g., in parking lots to reduce evaporative emissions from parked vehicles.

When combined, these measures offer a cost-effective, feasible way to incorporate lower-emitting design features into the proposed Project, which subsequently, reduces emissions released during Project operation. An updated EIR should be prepared to include additional mitigation measures, as well as include an updated air quality analysis to ensure that the necessary mitigation measures are implemented to reduce emissions to below thresholds. The EIR also needs to demonstrate commitment to the implementation of these measures prior to Project approval, to ensure that the Project's significant emissions are reduced to the maximum extent possible.

8.116

8.117

SWAPE has received limited discovery 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,

Moran

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

⁵⁰ HARC (July 2004) Cool Houston Plan, <u>http://www.harcresearch.org/sites/default/files/documents/projects/CoolHoustonPlan_0.pdf</u>

Paul Roenfeld

Paul E. Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

Page 1 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

Palomar Crossing Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	6.50	Acre	6.50	283,140.00	0
Parking Lot	574.73	1000sqft	13.19	574,727.00	0
Apartments Low Rise	637.00	Dwelling Unit	17.66	637,000.00	1822
Regional Shopping Center	246.31	1000sqft	5.65	246,312.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	Speed (m/s) 2.4 Precipitation Fi		
Climate Zone	10			Operational Year	2023
Utility Company	Southern California Edisor	ı			
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	702.44	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.029	N2O Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Construction Phase - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Grading - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Architectural Coating - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Vehicle Trips - See SWAPE comment about trip purpose percentage.

Woodstoves - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Area Coating -

Land Use Change -

Sequestration - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Mobile Land Use Mitigation - See SWAPE about mobile mitigation measures.

Energy Mitigation - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Water Mitigation - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Waste Mitigation -

Page 3 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value		
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Exterior	100.00	10.00		
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Interior	100.00	10.00		
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Exterior	50.00	10.00		
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Interior	50.00	10.00		
tblConstDustMitigation	WaterUnpavedRoadVehicleSpeed	0	15		
tblFireplaces	NumberGas	541.45	573.30		
tblFireplaces	NumberWood	31.85	0.00		
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	21.50		
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	574,730.00	574,727.00		
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	246,310.00	246,312.00		
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	39.81	17.66		
tblSequestration	NumberOfNewTrees	0.00	130.00		
tblVehicleTrips	PB_TP	3.00	0.00		
tblVehicleTrips	PB_TP	11.00	0.00		
tblVehicleTrips	PR_TP	86.00	89.00		
tblVehicleTrips	PR_TP	54.00	65.00		
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	7.16	7.06		
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	49.97	27.82		
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	6.07	7.06		
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	25.24	27.82		
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	6.59	7.06		
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	42.70	27.82		
tblWoodstoves	NumberCatalytic	31.85	0.00		
tblWoodstoves	NumberNoncatalytic	31.85	0.00		

2.0 Emissions Summary

Page 4 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

2.1 Overall Construction

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr											МТ	/yr			
2019	0.6004	5.1727	4.2413	0.0116	1.1452	0.1974	1.3427	0.4295	0.1832	0.6127	0.0000	1,053.850 3	1,053.850 3	0.1438	0.0000	1,057.445 6
2020	0.9110	6.2849	6.9159	0.0239	1.4990	0.1735	1.6725	0.4028	0.1633	0.5661	0.0000	2,187.260 2	2,187.260 2	0.1652	0.0000	2,191.390 8
2021	0.8280	5.6433	6.4352	0.0233	1.4933	0.1386	1.6319	0.4012	0.1303	0.5315	0.0000	2,136.695 5	2,136.695 5	0.1577	0.0000	2,140.637 2
2022	1.0736	2.8476	3.5167	0.0122	0.7741	0.0747	0.8488	0.2078	0.0701	0.2779	0.0000	1,109.928 6	1,109.928 6	0.0919	0.0000	1,112.2248
Maximum	1.0736	6.2849	6.9159	0.0239	1.4990	0.1974	1.6725	0.4295	0.1832	0.6127	0.0000	2,187.260 2	2,187.260 2	0.1652	0.0000	2,191.390 8

Page 5 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

2.1 Overall Construction

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr									MT/yr						
2019	0.6004	5.1727	4.2413	0.0116	1.1452	0.1974	1.3427	0.4295	0.1832	0.6127	0.0000	1,053.849 8	1,053.849 8	0.1438	0.0000	1,057.445 2
2020	0.9110	6.2849	6.9159	0.0239	1.4990	0.1735	1.6725	0.4028	0.1633	0.5661	0.0000	2,187.259 9	2,187.259 9	0.1652	0.0000	2,191.390 4
2021	0.8280	5.6433	6.4352	0.0233	1.4933	0.1386	1.6319	0.4012	0.1303	0.5315	0.0000	2,136.695 2	2,136.695 2	0.1577	0.0000	2,140.636 9
2022	1.0736	2.8476	3.5167	0.0122	0.7741	0.0747	0.8488	0.2078	0.0701	0.2779	0.0000	1,109.928 3	1,109.928 3	0.0919	0.0000	1,112.2246
Maximum	1.0736	6.2849	6.9159	0.0239	1.4990	0.1974	1.6725	0.4295	0.1832	0.6127	0.0000	2,187.259 9	2,187.259 9	0.1652	0.0000	2,191.390 4
	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Quarter	Sta	art Date	Enc	d Date	Maxim	um Unmitig	ated ROG +	NOX (tons/	quarter)	Maxin	num Mitigat	ted ROG + N	OX (tons/qu	arter)		
1	4-	1-2019	6-30	0-2019			1.7979									
2	7-	1-2019	9-30	0-2019			1.9686					1.9686				
3	10	-1-2019	12-3	1-2019			1.9899									
4	1-	1-2020	3-31	1-2020			1.7808					1.7808				
5	4-	1-2020	6-30	0-2020		1.7840				1.7840						
6	7-	1-2020	9-30	0-2020	1.8036					1.8036						
7	10	-1-2020	12-3	1-2020			1.8004					1.8004				
8	1-	1-2021	3-31	1-2021			1.5904			1.5904						

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

9	4-1-2021	6-30-2021	1.6133	1.6133
10	7-1-2021	9-30-2021	1.6310	1.6310
11	10-1-2021	12-31-2021	1.6258	1.6258
12	1-1-2022	3-31-2022	1.4656	1.4656
13	4-1-2022	6-30-2022	1.4172	1.4172
14	7-1-2022	9-30-2022	0.5223	0.5223
		Highest	1.9899	1.9899

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr				MT	/yr					
Area	3.7855	0.1947	6.6318	1.1100e- 003		0.0460	0.0460		0.0460	0.0460	0.0000	148.4218	148.4218	0.0130	2.5200e- 003	149.4992
Energy	0.0564	0.4840	0.2170	3.0800e- 003		0.0390	0.0390		0.0390	0.0390	0.0000	2,600.345 4	2,600.345 4	0.0950	0.0277	2,610.969 3
Mobile	2.8096	20.1482	33.7504	0.1608	12.7003	0.0914	12.7918	3.4023	0.0852	3.4875	0.0000	14,923.35 26	14,923.35 26	0.6738	0.0000	14,940.19 64
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	111.9800	0.0000	111.9800	6.6178	0.0000	277.4256
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	18.9553	380.0855	399.0407	1.9626	0.0492	462.7718
Total	6.6516	20.8269	40.5992	0.1650	12.7003	0.1765	12.8768	3.4023	0.1702	3.5725	130.9352	18,052.20 52	18,183.14 04	9.3622	0.0794	18,440.86 23

Page 7 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

2.2 Overall Operational

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CC		SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugit PM2		aust 12.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO	2 NBic	- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category						to	ns/yr									M	Г/yr		
Area	3.7855	0.1947	6.63		1100e- 003		0.0460	0.0460		0.0	460	0.0460	0.0000	148	.4218	148.4218	0.0130	2.5200e- 003	149.4992
Energy	0.0564	0.4840	0.21		0800e- 003		0.0390	0.0390		0.0	390	0.0390	0.0000	2,57	8.194 2	2,578.194 2	0.0941	0.0275	2,588.738 8
Mobile	2.8096	20.1482	33.75	504 0).1608	12.7003	0.0914	12.7918	3.40	23 0.0	852	3.4875	0.0000	• '	23.35 26	14,923.35 26	0.6738	0.0000	14,940.19 64
Waste	F1						0.0000	0.0000		0.0	000	0.0000	55.9900	0.0	0000	55.9900	3.3089	0.0000	138.7128
Water	,						0.0000	0.0000		0.0	000	0.0000	15.1642	322	.4449	337.6091	1.5708	0.0395	388.6597
Total	6.6516	20.8269	40.59	992 0	0.1650	12.7003	0.1765	12.8768	3.40	23 0.1	702	3.5725	71.1542		72.41 34	18,043.56 76	5.6606	0.0695	18,205.80 69
	ROG		NOx	CO	SC				VI10 otal	Fugitive PM2.5		aust PM2 12.5 Tot		- CO2	NBio-	CO2 Total	CO2 0	CH4 N	I20 CO20
Percent Reduction	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.0	00 0).00 (.00 0	.00	0.00	0.	00 0.0	00 4	5.66	0.4	4 0.7	77 3	9.54 1	2.44 1.27

Page 8 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

2.3 Vegetation

Vegetation

	CO2e
Category	MT
New Trees	92.0400
Total	92.0400

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	4/1/2019	5/10/2019	5	30	
2	Grading	Grading	5/11/2019	8/23/2019	5	75	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	8/24/2019	6/24/2022	5	740	
4	Paving	Paving	6/25/2022	9/9/2022	5	55	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	9/10/2022	11/25/2022	5	55	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 21.5

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 187.5

Acres of Paving: 19.69

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

Residential Indoor: 1,289,925; Residential Outdoor: 429,975; Non-Residential Indoor: 369,468; Non-Residential Outdoor: 123,156; Striped Parking Area: 51,472 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Grading	Excavators	2	8.00	158	0.38
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Grading	Scrapers	2	8.00	367	0.48
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Paving	Pavers	2	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	8.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48

Trips and VMT

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	8	20.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	898.00	249.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	180.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area

Reduce Vehicle Speed on Unpaved Roads

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.2824	0.0000	0.2824	0.1502	0.0000	0.1502	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0650	0.6836	0.3310	5.7000e- 004		0.0359	0.0359		0.0330	0.0330	0.0000	51.2530	51.2530	0.0162	0.0000	51.6584
Total	0.0650	0.6836	0.3310	5.7000e- 004	0.2824	0.0359	0.3183	0.1502	0.0330	0.1832	0.0000	51.2530	51.2530	0.0162	0.0000	51.6584

Page 11 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton				МТ	/yr						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.3400e- 003	9.8000e- 004	0.0102	3.0000e- 005	2.9700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.9900e- 003	7.9000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	8.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.5639	2.5639	7.0000e- 005	0.0000	2.5657
Total	1.3400e- 003	9.8000e- 004	0.0102	3.0000e- 005	2.9700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.9900e- 003	7.9000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	8.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.5639	2.5639	7.0000e- 005	0.0000	2.5657

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.2824	0.0000	0.2824	0.1502	0.0000	0.1502	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0650	0.6836	0.3309	5.7000e- 004		0.0359	0.0359		0.0330	0.0330	0.0000	51.2530	51.2530	0.0162	0.0000	51.6584
Total	0.0650	0.6836	0.3309	5.7000e- 004	0.2824	0.0359	0.3183	0.1502	0.0330	0.1832	0.0000	51.2530	51.2530	0.0162	0.0000	51.6584

Page 12 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	'/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.3400e- 003	9.8000e- 004	0.0102	3.0000e- 005	2.9700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.9900e- 003	7.9000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	8.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.5639	2.5639	7.0000e- 005	0.0000	2.5657
Total	1.3400e- 003	9.8000e- 004	0.0102	3.0000e- 005	2.9700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.9900e- 003	7.9000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	8.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.5639	2.5639	7.0000e- 005	0.0000	2.5657

3.3 Grading - 2019

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.3253	0.0000	0.3253	0.1349	0.0000	0.1349	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.1777	2.0445	1.2516	2.3300e- 003		0.0894	0.0894		0.0822	0.0822	0.0000	208.8800	208.8800	0.0661	0.0000	210.5321
Total	0.1777	2.0445	1.2516	2.3300e- 003	0.3253	0.0894	0.4146	0.1349	0.0822	0.2171	0.0000	208.8800	208.8800	0.0661	0.0000	210.5321

Page 13 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.3 Grading - 2019

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr				МТ	/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.7300e- 003	2.7100e- 003	0.0285	8.0000e- 005	8.2400e- 003	5.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 003	2.1900e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.2400e- 003	0.0000	7.1221	7.1221	1.9000e- 004	0.0000	7.1269
Total	3.7300e- 003	2.7100e- 003	0.0285	8.0000e- 005	8.2400e- 003	5.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 003	2.1900e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.2400e- 003	0.0000	7.1221	7.1221	1.9000e- 004	0.0000	7.1269

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.3253	0.0000	0.3253	0.1349	0.0000	0.1349	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.1777	2.0445	1.2516	2.3300e- 003		0.0894	0.0894		0.0822	0.0822	0.0000	208.8797	208.8797	0.0661	0.0000	210.5319
Total	0.1777	2.0445	1.2516	2.3300e- 003	0.3253	0.0894	0.4146	0.1349	0.0822	0.2171	0.0000	208.8797	208.8797	0.0661	0.0000	210.5319

Page 14 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.3 Grading - 2019

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	'/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.7300e- 003	2.7100e- 003	0.0285	8.0000e- 005	8.2400e- 003	5.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 003	2.1900e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.2400e- 003	0.0000	7.1221	7.1221	1.9000e- 004	0.0000	7.1269
Total	3.7300e- 003	2.7100e- 003	0.0285	8.0000e- 005	8.2400e- 003	5.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 003	2.1900e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.2400e- 003	0.0000	7.1221	7.1221	1.9000e- 004	0.0000	7.1269

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.1086	0.9696	0.7895	1.2400e- 003		0.0593	0.0593	1 1 1	0.0558	0.0558	0.0000	108.1479	108.1479	0.0264	0.0000	108.8066
Total	0.1086	0.9696	0.7895	1.2400e- 003		0.0593	0.0593		0.0558	0.0558	0.0000	108.1479	108.1479	0.0264	0.0000	108.8066

Page 15 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	'/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0388	1.3218	0.2631	2.9700e- 003	0.0724	9.9600e- 003	0.0823	0.0209	9.5200e- 003	0.0304	0.0000	283.6193	283.6193	0.0242	0.0000	284.2234
Worker	0.2052	0.1494	1.5674	4.3400e- 003	0.4540	2.8500e- 003	0.4569	0.1206	2.6300e- 003	0.1232	0.0000	392.2641	392.2641	0.0107	0.0000	392.5324
Total	0.2440	1.4713	1.8305	7.3100e- 003	0.5264	0.0128	0.5392	0.1414	0.0122	0.1536	0.0000	675.8834	675.8834	0.0349	0.0000	676.7559

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.1086	0.9696	0.7895	1.2400e- 003		0.0593	0.0593		0.0558	0.0558	0.0000	108.1478	108.1478	0.0264	0.0000	108.8065
Total	0.1086	0.9696	0.7895	1.2400e- 003		0.0593	0.0593		0.0558	0.0558	0.0000	108.1478	108.1478	0.0264	0.0000	108.8065

Page 16 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0388	1.3218	0.2631	2.9700e- 003	0.0724	9.9600e- 003	0.0823	0.0209	9.5200e- 003	0.0304	0.0000	283.6193	283.6193	0.0242	0.0000	284.2234
Worker	0.2052	0.1494	1.5674	4.3400e- 003	0.4540	2.8500e- 003	0.4569	0.1206	2.6300e- 003	0.1232	0.0000	392.2641	392.2641	0.0107	0.0000	392.5324
Total	0.2440	1.4713	1.8305	7.3100e- 003	0.5264	0.0128	0.5392	0.1414	0.0122	0.1536	0.0000	675.8834	675.8834	0.0349	0.0000	676.7559

3.4 Building Construction - 2020

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.2777	2.5134	2.2072	3.5300e- 003		0.1463	0.1463	1 1 1	0.1376	0.1376	0.0000	303.4091	303.4091	0.0740	0.0000	305.2596
Total	0.2777	2.5134	2.2072	3.5300e- 003		0.1463	0.1463		0.1376	0.1376	0.0000	303.4091	303.4091	0.0740	0.0000	305.2596

Page 17 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2020

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0927	3.3927	0.6637	8.3900e- 003	0.2060	0.0192	0.2252	0.0594	0.0184	0.0778	0.0000	802.0610	802.0610	0.0641	0.0000	803.6639
Worker	0.5407	0.3788	4.0450	0.0120	1.2930	7.9600e- 003	1.3010	0.3433	7.3300e- 003	0.3507	0.0000	1,081.790 2	1,081.790 2	0.0271	0.0000	1,082.467 4
Total	0.6333	3.7716	4.7087	0.0204	1.4990	0.0271	1.5262	0.4028	0.0257	0.4285	0.0000	1,883.851 2	1,883.851 2	0.0912	0.0000	1,886.131 2

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.2777	2.5134	2.2072	3.5300e- 003		0.1463	0.1463		0.1376	0.1376	0.0000	303.4087	303.4087	0.0740	0.0000	305.2592
Total	0.2777	2.5134	2.2072	3.5300e- 003		0.1463	0.1463		0.1376	0.1376	0.0000	303.4087	303.4087	0.0740	0.0000	305.2592

Page 18 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2020

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0927	3.3927	0.6637	8.3900e- 003	0.2060	0.0192	0.2252	0.0594	0.0184	0.0778	0.0000	802.0610	802.0610	0.0641	0.0000	803.6639
Worker	0.5407	0.3788	4.0450	0.0120	1.2930	7.9600e- 003	1.3010	0.3433	7.3300e- 003	0.3507	0.0000	1,081.790 2	1,081.790 2	0.0271	0.0000	1,082.467 4
Total	0.6333	3.7716	4.7087	0.0204	1.4990	0.0271	1.5262	0.4028	0.0257	0.4285	0.0000	1,883.851 2	1,883.851 2	0.0912	0.0000	1,886.131 2

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.2481	2.2749	2.1631	3.5100e- 003		0.1251	0.1251		0.1176	0.1176	0.0000	302.2867	302.2867	0.0729	0.0000	304.1099
Total	0.2481	2.2749	2.1631	3.5100e- 003		0.1251	0.1251		0.1176	0.1176	0.0000	302.2867	302.2867	0.0729	0.0000	304.1099

Page 19 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	'/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0775	3.0299	0.5829	8.2900e- 003	0.2052	5.7900e- 003	0.2110	0.0592	5.5400e- 003	0.0648	0.0000	792.7787	792.7787	0.0605	0.0000	794.2906
Worker	0.5024	0.3386	3.6892	0.0115	1.2881	7.7200e- 003	1.2958	0.3420	7.1100e- 003	0.3491	0.0000	1,041.630 2	1,041.630 2	0.0243	0.0000	1,042.236 8
Total	0.5800	3.3685	4.2721	0.0198	1.4933	0.0135	1.5068	0.4012	0.0127	0.4139	0.0000	1,834.408 9	1,834.408 9	0.0847	0.0000	1,836.527 4

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.2481	2.2749	2.1631	3.5100e- 003		0.1251	0.1251	1 1 1	0.1176	0.1176	0.0000	302.2863	302.2863	0.0729	0.0000	304.1095
Total	0.2481	2.2749	2.1631	3.5100e- 003		0.1251	0.1251		0.1176	0.1176	0.0000	302.2863	302.2863	0.0729	0.0000	304.1095

Page 20 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0775	3.0299	0.5829	8.2900e- 003	0.2052	5.7900e- 003	0.2110	0.0592	5.5400e- 003	0.0648	0.0000	792.7787	792.7787	0.0605	0.0000	794.2906
Worker	0.5024	0.3386	3.6892	0.0115	1.2881	7.7200e- 003	1.2958	0.3420	7.1100e- 003	0.3491	0.0000	1,041.630 2	1,041.630 2	0.0243	0.0000	1,042.236 8
Total	0.5800	3.3685	4.2721	0.0198	1.4933	0.0135	1.5068	0.4012	0.0127	0.4139	0.0000	1,834.408 9	1,834.408 9	0.0847	0.0000	1,836.527 4

3.4 Building Construction - 2022

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.1066	0.9760	1.0227	1.6800e- 003		0.0506	0.0506		0.0476	0.0476	0.0000	144.8283	144.8283	0.0347	0.0000	145.6957
Total	0.1066	0.9760	1.0227	1.6800e- 003		0.0506	0.0506		0.0476	0.0476	0.0000	144.8283	144.8283	0.0347	0.0000	145.6957

Page 21 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2022

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0346	1.3671	0.2600	3.9300e- 003	0.0983	2.3300e- 003	0.1006	0.0284	2.2300e- 003	0.0306	0.0000	376.4173	376.4173	0.0274	0.0000	377.1033
Worker	0.2255	0.1459	1.6276	5.3100e- 003	0.6169	3.6000e- 003	0.6205	0.1638	3.3100e- 003	0.1671	0.0000	480.6607	480.6607	0.0104	0.0000	480.9219
Total	0.2601	1.5130	1.8877	9.2400e- 003	0.7152	5.9300e- 003	0.7211	0.1922	5.5400e- 003	0.1977	0.0000	857.0780	857.0780	0.0379	0.0000	858.0251

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.1066	0.9760	1.0227	1.6800e- 003		0.0506	0.0506		0.0476	0.0476	0.0000	144.8281	144.8281	0.0347	0.0000	145.6955
Total	0.1066	0.9760	1.0227	1.6800e- 003		0.0506	0.0506		0.0476	0.0476	0.0000	144.8281	144.8281	0.0347	0.0000	145.6955

Page 22 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2022

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0346	1.3671	0.2600	3.9300e- 003	0.0983	2.3300e- 003	0.1006	0.0284	2.2300e- 003	0.0306	0.0000	376.4173	376.4173	0.0274	0.0000	377.1033
Worker	0.2255	0.1459	1.6276	5.3100e- 003	0.6169	3.6000e- 003	0.6205	0.1638	3.3100e- 003	0.1671	0.0000	480.6607	480.6607	0.0104	0.0000	480.9219
Total	0.2601	1.5130	1.8877	9.2400e- 003	0.7152	5.9300e- 003	0.7211	0.1922	5.5400e- 003	0.1977	0.0000	857.0780	857.0780	0.0379	0.0000	858.0251

3.5 Paving - 2022

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	∵/yr		
Off-Road	0.0303	0.3059	0.4010	6.3000e- 004		0.0156	0.0156		0.0144	0.0144	0.0000	55.0758	55.0758	0.0178	0.0000	55.5211
Paving	0.0173					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0476	0.3059	0.4010	6.3000e- 004		0.0156	0.0156		0.0144	0.0144	0.0000	55.0758	55.0758	0.0178	0.0000	55.5211

Page 23 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.5 Paving - 2022

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.6600e- 003	1.0700e- 003	0.0120	4.0000e- 005	4.5300e- 003	3.0000e- 005	4.5600e- 003	1.2000e- 003	2.0000e- 005	1.2300e- 003	0.0000	3.5327	3.5327	8.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.5346
Total	1.6600e- 003	1.0700e- 003	0.0120	4.0000e- 005	4.5300e- 003	3.0000e- 005	4.5600e- 003	1.2000e- 003	2.0000e- 005	1.2300e- 003	0.0000	3.5327	3.5327	8.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.5346

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0303	0.3059	0.4010	6.3000e- 004		0.0156	0.0156		0.0144	0.0144	0.0000	55.0757	55.0757	0.0178	0.0000	55.5210
Paving	0.0173					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0476	0.3059	0.4010	6.3000e- 004		0.0156	0.0156		0.0144	0.0144	0.0000	55.0757	55.0757	0.0178	0.0000	55.5210

Page 24 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.5 Paving - 2022

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.6600e- 003	1.0700e- 003	0.0120	4.0000e- 005	4.5300e- 003	3.0000e- 005	4.5600e- 003	1.2000e- 003	2.0000e- 005	1.2300e- 003	0.0000	3.5327	3.5327	8.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.5346
Total	1.6600e- 003	1.0700e- 003	0.0120	4.0000e- 005	4.5300e- 003	3.0000e- 005	4.5600e- 003	1.2000e- 003	2.0000e- 005	1.2300e- 003	0.0000	3.5327	3.5327	8.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.5346

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	∵/yr		
Archit. Coating	0.6320					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	5.6200e- 003	0.0387	0.0499	8.0000e- 005		2.2500e- 003	2.2500e- 003		2.2500e- 003	2.2500e- 003	0.0000	7.0215	7.0215	4.6000e- 004	0.0000	7.0329
Total	0.6377	0.0387	0.0499	8.0000e- 005		2.2500e- 003	2.2500e- 003		2.2500e- 003	2.2500e- 003	0.0000	7.0215	7.0215	4.6000e- 004	0.0000	7.0329

Page 25 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	'/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0199	0.0129	0.1436	4.7000e- 004	0.0544	3.2000e- 004	0.0547	0.0145	2.9000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000	42.3924	42.3924	9.2000e- 004	0.0000	42.4154
Total	0.0199	0.0129	0.1436	4.7000e- 004	0.0544	3.2000e- 004	0.0547	0.0145	2.9000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000	42.3924	42.3924	9.2000e- 004	0.0000	42.4154

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Archit. Coating	0.6320					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	5.6200e- 003	0.0387	0.0499	8.0000e- 005		2.2500e- 003	2.2500e- 003		2.2500e- 003	2.2500e- 003	0.0000	7.0214	7.0214	4.6000e- 004	0.0000	7.0329
Total	0.6377	0.0387	0.0499	8.0000e- 005		2.2500e- 003	2.2500e- 003		2.2500e- 003	2.2500e- 003	0.0000	7.0214	7.0214	4.6000e- 004	0.0000	7.0329

Page 26 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0199	0.0129	0.1436	4.7000e- 004	0.0544	3.2000e- 004	0.0547	0.0145	2.9000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000	42.3924	42.3924	9.2000e- 004	0.0000	42.4154
Total	0.0199	0.0129	0.1436	4.7000e- 004	0.0544	3.2000e- 004	0.0547	0.0145	2.9000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000	42.3924	42.3924	9.2000e- 004	0.0000	42.4154

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

Page 27 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Mitigated	2.8096	20.1482	33.7504	0.1608	12.7003	0.0914	12.7918	3.4023	0.0852	3.4875	0.0000	14,923.35 26	14,923.35 26	0.6738	0.0000	14,940.19 64
Unmitigated	2.8096	20.1482	33.7504	0.1608	12.7003	0.0914	12.7918	3.4023	0.0852	3.4875	0.0000	14,923.35 26	14,923.35 26	0.6738	0.0000	14,940.19 64

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Ave	rage Daily Trip Ra	ate	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Apartments Low Rise	4,497.22	4,497.22	4497.22	15,882,078	15,882,078
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Regional Shopping Center	6,852.34	6,852.34	6852.34	17,386,330	17,386,330
Total	11,349.56	11,349.56	11,349.56	33,268,408	33,268,408

4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpos	e %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Apartments Low Rise	14.70	5.90	8.70	40.20	19.20	40.60	89	11	0
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	16.60	8.40	6.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Parking Lot	16.60	8.40	6.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Regional Shopping Center	16.60	8.40	6.90	16.30	64.70	19.00	65	35	0

4.4 Fleet Mix

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Apartments Low Rise	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898
Parking Lot	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898
Regional Shopping Center	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Install High Efficiency Lighting

Install Energy Efficient Appliances

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Electricity Mitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2,019.594 2	2,019.594 2	0.0834	0.0173	2,026.819 3
Electricity Unmitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2,041.745 4	2,041.745 4	0.0843	0.0174	2,049.049 8
NaturalGas Mitigated	0.0564	0.4840	0.2170	3.0800e- 003		0.0390	0.0390		0.0390	0.0390	0.0000	558.6000	558.6000	0.0107	0.0102	561.9195
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.0564	0.4840	0.2170	3.0800e- 003		0.0390	0.0390	 , , ,	0.0390	0.0390	0.0000	558.6000	558.6000	0.0107	0.0102	561.9195

Page 29 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					ton	s/yr							MT	'/yr		
Apartments Low Rise	9.92096e +006	0.0535	0.4571	0.1945	2.9200e- 003		0.0370	0.0370		0.0370	0.0370	0.0000	529.4200	529.4200	0.0102	9.7100e- 003	532.5661
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	546813	2.9500e- 003	0.0268	0.0225	1.6000e- 004		2.0400e- 003	2.0400e- 003		2.0400e- 003	2.0400e- 003	0.0000	29.1800	29.1800	5.6000e- 004	5.3000e- 004	29.3534
Total		0.0565	0.4839	0.2171	3.0800e- 003		0.0390	0.0390		0.0390	0.0390	0.0000	558.6000	558.6000	0.0107	0.0102	561.9195

Page 30 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Mitigated

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Apartments Low Rise	9.92096e +006	0.0535	0.4571	0.1945	2.9200e- 003		0.0370	0.0370		0.0370	0.0370	0.0000	529.4200	529.4200	0.0102	9.7100e- 003	532.5661
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	546813	2.9500e- 003	0.0268	0.0225	1.6000e- 004		2.0400e- 003	2.0400e- 003		2.0400e- 003	2.0400e- 003	0.0000	29.1800	29.1800	5.6000e- 004	5.3000e- 004	29.3534
Total		0.0565	0.4839	0.2171	3.0800e- 003		0.0390	0.0390		0.0390	0.0390	0.0000	558.6000	558.6000	0.0107	0.0102	561.9195

Page 31 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr		ΜT	7/yr	
Apartments Low Rise	3.09599e +006	986.4474	0.0407	8.4300e- 003	989.9764
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	201154	64.0921	2.6500e- 003	5.5000e- 004	64.3214
Regional Shopping Center	3.11092e +006	991.2059	0.0409	8.4700e- 003	994.7520
Total		2,041.745 4	0.0843	0.0175	2,049.049 8

Page 32 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity

Mitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr		MT	7/yr	
Apartments Low Rise	3.02646e +006	964.2961	0.0398	8.2400e- 003	967.7459
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	201154	64.0921	2.6500e- 003	5.5000e- 004	64.3214
Regional Shopping Center	3.11092e +006	991.2059	0.0409	8.4700e- 003	994.7520
Total		2,019.594 2	0.0834	0.0173	2,026.819 3

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

Page 33 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Mitigated	3.7855	0.1947	6.6318	1.1100e- 003		0.0460	0.0460		0.0460	0.0460	0.0000	148.4218	148.4218	0.0130	2.5200e- 003	149.4992
Unmitigated	3.7855	0.1947	6.6318	1.1100e- 003		0.0460	0.0460	 	0.0460	0.0460	0.0000	148.4218	148.4218	0.0130	2.5200e- 003	149.4992

6.2 Area by SubCategory

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Architectural Coating	0.3254					0.0000	0.0000	1 1 1	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	3.2473					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	0.0139	0.1189	0.0506	7.6000e- 004		9.6100e- 003	9.6100e- 003		9.6100e- 003	9.6100e- 003	0.0000	137.6706	137.6706	2.6400e- 003	2.5200e- 003	138.4887
Landscaping	0.1989	0.0758	6.5812	3.5000e- 004		0.0364	0.0364		0.0364	0.0364	0.0000	10.7512	10.7512	0.0104	0.0000	11.0105
Total	3.7855	0.1947	6.6318	1.1100e- 003		0.0460	0.0460		0.0460	0.0460	0.0000	148.4218	148.4218	0.0130	2.5200e- 003	149.4992

Page 34 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Architectural Coating	0.3254					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	3.2473					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	0.0139	0.1189	0.0506	7.6000e- 004		9.6100e- 003	9.6100e- 003		9.6100e- 003	9.6100e- 003	0.0000	137.6706	137.6706	2.6400e- 003	2.5200e- 003	138.4887
Landscaping	0.1989	0.0758	6.5812	3.5000e- 004		0.0364	0.0364		0.0364	0.0364	0.0000	10.7512	10.7512	0.0104	0.0000	11.0105
Total	3.7855	0.1947	6.6318	1.1100e- 003		0.0460	0.0460		0.0460	0.0460	0.0000	148.4218	148.4218	0.0130	2.5200e- 003	149.4992

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

Install Low Flow Bathroom Faucet

Install Low Flow Kitchen Faucet

Install Low Flow Toilet

Install Low Flow Shower

Use Water Efficient Irrigation System

Page 35 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category		MI	/yr	
	337.6091	1.5708	0.0395	388.6597
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	399.0407	1.9626	0.0492	462.7718

7.2 Water by Land Use

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	Indoor/Out door Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal		МТ	ī/yr	
Apartments Low Rise	41.5031 / 26.165	277.9750	1.3633	0.0342	322.2477
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0/0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0/0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	18.2448 / 11.1823	121.0658	0.5993	0.0150	140.5241
Total		399.0407	1.9626	0.0492	462.7718

Page 36 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

7.2 Water by Land Use

Mitigated

	Indoor/Out door Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal		МТ	7/yr	
Apartments Low Rise	33.2025 / 24.5689	235.2543	1.0912	0.0275	270.7186
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0/0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0/0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	14.5958 / 10.5002	102.3548	0.4796	0.0121	117.9411
Total		337.6091	1.5708	0.0395	388.6597

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

Institute Recycling and Composting Services

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

Page 37 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

Category/Year

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
		МТ	/yr	
Intigatoa	55.9900	3.3089	0.0000	138.7128
	111.9800	6.6178	0.0000	277.4256

8.2 Waste by Land Use

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons		МТ	7/yr	
Apartments Low Rise	293.02	59.4804	3.5152	0.0000	147.3602
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	258.63	52.4996	3.1026	0.0000	130.0654
Total		111.9800	6.6178	0.0000	277.4256

Page 38 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

8.2 Waste by Land Use

Mitigated

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons		МТ	/yr	
Apartments Low Rise	146.51	29.7402	1.7576	0.0000	73.6801
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	129.315	26.2498	1.5513	0.0000	65.0327
Total		55.9900	3.3089	0.0000	138.7128

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type Number Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
---------------------------------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-----------

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type Number Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
---------------------------------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------

User Defined Equipment

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

Page 39 of 39

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

Equipment Type Number

11.0 Vegetation

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category		N	IT	
		0.0000	0.0000	92.0400

11.2 Net New Trees Species Class

	Number of Trees	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
		МТ			
Miscellaneous	130	92.0400	0.0000	0.0000	92.0400
Total		92.0400	0.0000	0.0000	92.0400

Page 1 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

Palomar Crossing

Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	6.50	Acre	6.50	283,140.00	0
Parking Lot	574.73	1000sqft	13.19	574,727.00	0
Apartments Low Rise	637.00	Dwelling Unit	17.66	637,000.00	1822
Regional Shopping Center	246.31	1000sqft	5.65	246,312.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.4	Precipitation Freq (Days)	28	
Climate Zone	10			Operational Year	2023	
Utility Company	Southern California Edison					
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	702.44	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.029	N2O Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.006	

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

8.119

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Construction Phase - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Grading - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Architectural Coating - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Vehicle Trips - See SWAPE comment about trip purpose percentage.

Woodstoves - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Area Coating -

Land Use Change -

Sequestration - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Mobile Land Use Mitigation - See SWAPE about mobile mitigation measures.

Energy Mitigation - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Water Mitigation - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Waste Mitigation -

Page 3 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Exterior	100.00	10.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Interior	100.00	10.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Exterior	50.00	10.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Interior	50.00	10.00
tblConstDustMitigation	WaterUnpavedRoadVehicleSpeed	0	15
tblFireplaces	NumberGas	541.45	573.30
tblFireplaces	NumberWood	31.85	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	21.50
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	574,730.00	574,727.00
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	246,310.00	246,312.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	39.81	17.66
tblSequestration	NumberOfNewTrees	0.00	130.00
tblVehicleTrips	PB_TP	3.00	0.00
tblVehicleTrips	PB_TP	11.00	0.00
tblVehicleTrips	PR_TP	86.00	89.00
tblVehicleTrips	PR_TP	54.00	65.00
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	7.16	7.06
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	49.97	27.82
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	6.07	7.06
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	25.24	27.82
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	6.59	7.06
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	42.70	27.82
tblWoodstoves	NumberCatalytic	31.85	0.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberNoncatalytic	31.85	0.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

Page 4 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
2019	8.1349	54.5878	62.3696	0.1950	19.0275	2.3916	21.4191	10.0661	2.2003	12.2664	0.0000	19,711.365 7	19,711.365 7	1.9490	0.0000	19,748.110 4
2020	7.3836	47.5087	57.7442	0.1913	11.6320	1.3236	12.9556	3.1211	1.2457	4.3668	0.0000	19,302.61 60	19,302.61 60	1.3907	0.0000	19,337.38 47
2021	6.7396	42.8998	53.8865	0.1874	11.6320	1.0616	12.6936	3.1211	0.9977	4.1187	0.0000	18,918.77 75	18,918.77 75	1.3308	0.0000	18,952.04 64
2022	23.9860	39.5380	50.8099	0.1833	11.6319	0.9035	12.5353	3.1210	0.8494	3.9705	0.0000	18,512.46 80	18,512.46 80	1.2777	0.0000	18,544.411 1
Maximum	23.9860	54.5878	62.3696	0.1950	19.0275	2.3916	21.4191	10.0661	2.2003	12.2664	0.0000	19,711.36 57	19,711.36 57	1.9490	0.0000	19,748.11 04

Page 5 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Tota	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/	day							lb/	day		
2019	8.1349	54.5878	62.3696	0.1950	19.0275	2.3916	21.4191	10.0661	2.2003	12.2664	0.0000	19,711.365 7	19,711.365 7	1.9490	0.0000	19,748.11 04
2020	7.3836	47.5087	57.7442	0.1913	11.6320	1.3236	12.9556	3.1211	1.2457	4.3668	0.0000	19,302.61 60	19,302.61 60	1.3907	0.0000	19,337.38 46
2021	6.7396	42.8998	53.8865	0.1874	11.6320	1.0616	12.6936	3.1211	0.9977	4.1187	0.0000	18,918.77 75	18,918.77 75	1.3308	0.0000	18,952.04 64
2022	23.9860	39.5380	50.8099	0.1833	11.6319	0.9035	12.5353	3.1210	0.8494	3.9705	0.0000	18,512.46 80	18,512.46 80	1.2777	0.0000	18,544.411 1
Maximum	23.9860	54.5878	62.3696	0.1950	19.0275	2.3916	21.4191	10.0661	2.2003	12.2664	0.0000	19,711.36 57	19,711.36 57	1.9490	0.0000	19,748.11 04
	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Page 6 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Area	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.71 10
Energy	0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6
Mobile	18.4058	109.4792	207.4799	0.9358	70.9408	0.5015	71.4423	18.9783	0.4674	19.4457		95,621.64 00	95,621.64 00	4.0728		95,723.45 95
Total	40.9958	122.2477	265.3655	1.0161	70.9408	1.7753	72.7162	18.9783	1.7412	20.7196	0.0000	111,230.8 983	111,230.8 983	4.4616	0.2844	111,427.1 991

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Area	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.711 0
Energy	0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6
Mobile	18.4058	109.4792	207.4799	0.9358	70.9408	0.5015	71.4423	18.9783	0.4674	19.4457		95,621.64 00	95,621.64 00	4.0728		95,723.45 95
Total	40.9958	122.2477	265.3655	1.0161	70.9408	1.7753	72.7162	18.9783	1.7412	20.7196	0.0000	111,230.8 983	111,230.8 983	4.4616	0.2844	111,427.1 991

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	4/1/2019	5/10/2019	5	30	
2	Grading	Grading	5/11/2019	8/23/2019	5	75	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	8/24/2019	6/24/2022	5	740	
4	Paving	Paving	6/25/2022	9/9/2022	5	55	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	9/10/2022	11/25/2022	5	55	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 21.5

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 187.5

Acres of Paving: 19.69

Residential Indoor: 1,289,925; Residential Outdoor: 429,975; Non-Residential Indoor: 369,468; Non-Residential Outdoor: 123,156; Striped Parking Area: 51,472 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Grading	Excavators	2	8.00	158	0.38
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Grading	Scrapers	2	8.00	367	0.48
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Paving	Pavers	2	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	8.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	8	20.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	898.00	249.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	180.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

Page 9 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area

Reduce Vehicle Speed on Unpaved Roads

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust					18.8263	0.0000	18.8263	10.0128	0.0000	10.0128			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.3350	45.5727	22.0630	0.0380		2.3904	2.3904		2.1991	2.1991		3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9	1.1917		3,796.244 5
Total	4.3350	45.5727	22.0630	0.0380	18.8263	2.3904	21.2166	10.0128	2.1991	12.2119		3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9	1.1917		3,796.244 5

Page 10 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0991	0.0608	0.7997	2.0600e- 003	0.2012	1.2400e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1400e- 003	0.0545		204.7540	204.7540	5.7300e- 003		204.8973
Total	0.0991	0.0608	0.7997	2.0600e- 003	0.2012	1.2400e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1400e- 003	0.0545		204.7540	204.7540	5.7300e- 003		204.8973

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust					18.8263	0.0000	18.8263	10.0128	0.0000	10.0128			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.3350	45.5727	22.0630	0.0380		2.3904	2.3904		2.1991	2.1991	0.0000	3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9	1.1917		3,796.244 5
Total	4.3350	45.5727	22.0630	0.0380	18.8263	2.3904	21.2166	10.0128	2.1991	12.2119	0.0000	3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9	1.1917		3,796.244 5

Page 11 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0991	0.0608	0.7997	2.0600e- 003	0.2012	1.2400e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1400e- 003	0.0545		204.7540	204.7540	5.7300e- 003		204.8973
Total	0.0991	0.0608	0.7997	2.0600e- 003	0.2012	1.2400e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1400e- 003	0.0545		204.7540	204.7540	5.7300e- 003		204.8973

3.3 Grading - 2019

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
Fugitive Dust					8.6733	0.0000	8.6733	3.5965	0.0000	3.5965			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.7389	54.5202	33.3768	0.0620		2.3827	2.3827		2.1920	2.1920		6,140.019 5	6,140.019 5	1.9426		6,188.585 4
Total	4.7389	54.5202	33.3768	0.0620	8.6733	2.3827	11.0560	3.5965	2.1920	5.7885		6,140.019 5	6,140.019 5	1.9426		6,188.585 4

Page 12 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.3 Grading - 2019

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.1101	0.0676	0.8885	2.2900e- 003	0.2236	1.3800e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2700e- 003	0.0606		227.5045	227.5045	6.3700e- 003		227.6637
Total	0.1101	0.0676	0.8885	2.2900e- 003	0.2236	1.3800e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2700e- 003	0.0606		227.5045	227.5045	6.3700e- 003		227.6637

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust					8.6733	0.0000	8.6733	3.5965	0.0000	3.5965			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.7389	54.5202	33.3768	0.0620		2.3827	2.3827		2.1920	2.1920	0.0000	6,140.019 5	6,140.019 5	1.9426		6,188.585 4
Total	4.7389	54.5202	33.3768	0.0620	8.6733	2.3827	11.0560	3.5965	2.1920	5.7885	0.0000	6,140.019 5	6,140.019 5	1.9426		6,188.585 4

Page 13 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.3 Grading - 2019

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.1101	0.0676	0.8885	2.2900e- 003	0.2236	1.3800e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2700e- 003	0.0606		227.5045	227.5045	6.3700e- 003		227.6637
Total	0.1101	0.0676	0.8885	2.2900e- 003	0.2236	1.3800e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2700e- 003	0.0606		227.5045	227.5045	6.3700e- 003		227.6637

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/d	lay		
Off-Road	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899	1 1 1	1.2127	1.2127		2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5
Total	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899		1.2127	1.2127		2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5

Page 14 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.8294	28.3445	5.3117	0.0655	1.5946	0.2153	1.8099	0.4591	0.2060	0.6651		6,904.835 1	6,904.835 1	0.5525		6,918.647 1
Worker	4.9444	3.0343	39.8941	0.1026	10.0375	0.0620	10.0995	2.6620	0.0571	2.7191		10,214.95 04	10,214.95 04	0.2860		10,222.09 98
Total	5.7737	31.3788	45.2058	0.1681	11.6321	0.2773	11.9094	3.1211	0.2630	3.3842		17,119.78 55	17,119.78 55	0.8385		17,140.74 69

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/d	lay		
Off-Road	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899		1.2127	1.2127	0.0000	2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5
Total	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899		1.2127	1.2127	0.0000	2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5

Page 15 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.8294	28.3445	5.3117	0.0655	1.5946	0.2153	1.8099	0.4591	0.2060	0.6651		6,904.835 1	6,904.835 1	0.5525		6,918.647 1
Worker	4.9444	3.0343	39.8941	0.1026	10.0375	0.0620	10.0995	2.6620	0.0571	2.7191		10,214.95 04	10,214.95 04	0.2860		10,222.09 98
Total	5.7737	31.3788	45.2058	0.1681	11.6321	0.2773	11.9094	3.1211	0.2630	3.3842		17,119.78 55	17,119.78 55	0.8385		17,140.74 69

3.4 Building Construction - 2020

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	2.1198	19.1860	16.8485	0.0269		1.1171	1.1171		1.0503	1.0503		2,553.063 1	2,553.063 1	0.6229		2,568.634 5
Total	2.1198	19.1860	16.8485	0.0269		1.1171	1.1171		1.0503	1.0503		2,553.063 1	2,553.063 1	0.6229		2,568.634 5

Page 16 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2020

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/d	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.6940	25.6201	4.6870	0.0650	1.5945	0.1457	1.7402	0.4591	0.1394	0.5985		6,857.234 0	6,857.234 0	0.5143		6,870.092 1
Worker	4.5698	2.7026	36.2087	0.0993	10.0375	0.0608	10.0983	2.6620	0.0560	2.7180		9,892.319 0	9,892.319 0	0.2536		9,898.658 1
Total	5.2638	28.3226	40.8957	0.1644	11.6320	0.2065	11.8385	3.1211	0.1954	3.3165		16,749.55 30	16,749.55 30	0.7679		16,768.75 02

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Off-Road	2.1198	19.1860	16.8485	0.0269		1.1171	1.1171		1.0503	1.0503	0.0000	2,553.063 1	2,553.063 1	0.6229		2,568.634 5
Total	2.1198	19.1860	16.8485	0.0269		1.1171	1.1171		1.0503	1.0503	0.0000	2,553.063 1	2,553.063 1	0.6229		2,568.634 5

Page 17 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2020

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day		<u>.</u>					lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.6940	25.6201	4.6870	0.0650	1.5945	0.1457	1.7402	0.4591	0.1394	0.5985		6,857.234 0	6,857.234 0	0.5143		6,870.092 1
Worker	4.5698	2.7026	36.2087	0.0993	10.0375	0.0608	10.0983	2.6620	0.0560	2.7180		9,892.319 0	9,892.319 0	0.2536		9,898.658 1
Total	5.2638	28.3226	40.8957	0.1644	11.6320	0.2065	11.8385	3.1211	0.1954	3.3165		16,749.55 30	16,749.55 30	0.7679		16,768.75 02

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013		2,553.363 9	2,553.363 9	0.6160		2,568.764 3
Total	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013		2,553.363 9	2,553.363 9	0.6160		2,568.764 3

Page 18 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.5813	23.0423	4.1111	0.0645	1.5944	0.0438	1.6383	0.4591	0.0419	0.5010		6,803.950 5	6,803.950 5	0.4868		6,816.119 4
Worker	4.2574	2.4254	33.2001	0.0960	10.0375	0.0592	10.0967	2.6620	0.0545	2.7165		9,561.463 2	9,561.463 2	0.2280		9,567.162 8
Total	4.8387	25.4677	37.3113	0.1605	11.6320	0.1030	11.7349	3.1211	0.0964	3.2175		16,365.41 36	16,365.41 36	0.7148		16,383.28 22

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586	1 1 1	0.9013	0.9013	0.0000	2,553.363 9	2,553.363 9	0.6160		2,568.764 3
Total	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013	0.0000	2,553.363 9	2,553.363 9	0.6160		2,568.764 3

Page 19 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.5813	23.0423	4.1111	0.0645	1.5944	0.0438	1.6383	0.4591	0.0419	0.5010		6,803.950 5	6,803.950 5	0.4868		6,816.1194
Worker	4.2574	2.4254	33.2001	0.0960	10.0375	0.0592	10.0967	2.6620	0.0545	2.7165		9,561.463 2	9,561.463 2	0.2280		9,567.162 8
Total	4.8387	25.4677	37.3113	0.1605	11.6320	0.1030	11.7349	3.1211	0.0964	3.2175		16,365.41 36	16,365.41 36	0.7148		16,383.28 22

3.4 Building Construction - 2022

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612		2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2
Total	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612		2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2

Page 20 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2022

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.5420	21.7397	3.8238	0.0639	1.5944	0.0369	1.6312	0.4590	0.0352	0.4943		6,746.037 0	6,746.037 0	0.4610		6,757.561 8
Worker	3.9822	2.1827	30.6227	0.0924	10.0375	0.0576	10.0951	2.6620	0.0530	2.7150		9,212.097 4	9,212.097 4	0.2048		9,217.217 1
Total	4.5243	23.9224	34.4465	0.1564	11.6319	0.0944	11.7263	3.1210	0.0883	3.2093		15,958.13 44	15,958.13 44	0.6658		15,974.77 89

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Off-Road	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269	1	0.8090	0.8090	1	0.7612	0.7612	0.0000	2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2
Total	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612	0.0000	2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2

Page 21 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2022

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.5420	21.7397	3.8238	0.0639	1.5944	0.0369	1.6312	0.4590	0.0352	0.4943		6,746.037 0	6,746.037 0	0.4610		6,757.561 8
Worker	3.9822	2.1827	30.6227	0.0924	10.0375	0.0576	10.0951	2.6620	0.0530	2.7150		9,212.097 4	9,212.097 4	0.2048		9,217.217 1
Total	4.5243	23.9224	34.4465	0.1564	11.6319	0.0944	11.7263	3.1210	0.0883	3.2093		15,958.13 44	15,958.13 44	0.6658		15,974.77 89

3.5 Paving - 2022

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	1.1028	11.1249	14.5805	0.0228		0.5679	0.5679		0.5225	0.5225		2,207.660 3	2,207.660 3	0.7140		2,225.510 4
Paving	0.6283					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	1.7311	11.1249	14.5805	0.0228		0.5679	0.5679		0.5225	0.5225		2,207.660 3	2,207.660 3	0.7140		2,225.510 4

Page 22 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.5 Paving - 2022

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0665	0.0365	0.5115	1.5400e- 003	0.1677	9.6000e- 004	0.1686	0.0445	8.9000e- 004	0.0454		153.8769	153.8769	3.4200e- 003		153.9624
Total	0.0665	0.0365	0.5115	1.5400e- 003	0.1677	9.6000e- 004	0.1686	0.0445	8.9000e- 004	0.0454		153.8769	153.8769	3.4200e- 003		153.9624

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Off-Road	1.1028	11.1249	14.5805	0.0228		0.5679	0.5679		0.5225	0.5225	0.0000	2,207.660 3	2,207.660 3	0.7140		2,225.510 4
Paving	0.6283					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	1.7311	11.1249	14.5805	0.0228		0.5679	0.5679		0.5225	0.5225	0.0000	2,207.660 3	2,207.660 3	0.7140		2,225.510 4

Page 23 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.5 Paving - 2022

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0665	0.0365	0.5115	1.5400e- 003	0.1677	9.6000e- 004	0.1686	0.0445	8.9000e- 004	0.0454		153.8769	153.8769	3.4200e- 003		153.9624
Total	0.0665	0.0365	0.5115	1.5400e- 003	0.1677	9.6000e- 004	0.1686	0.0445	8.9000e- 004	0.0454		153.8769	153.8769	3.4200e- 003		153.9624

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Archit. Coating	22.9832					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	23.1878	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

Page 24 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.7982	0.4375	6.1382	0.0185	2.0120	0.0115	2.0235	0.5336	0.0106	0.5442		1,846.522 9	1,846.522 9	0.0411		1,847.549 1
Total	0.7982	0.4375	6.1382	0.0185	2.0120	0.0115	2.0235	0.5336	0.0106	0.5442		1,846.522 9	1,846.522 9	0.0411		1,847.549 1

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Archit. Coating	22.9832					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	23.1878	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

Page 25 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.7982	0.4375	6.1382	0.0185	2.0120	0.0115	2.0235	0.5336	0.0106	0.5442		1,846.522 9	1,846.522 9	0.0411		1,847.549 1
Total	0.7982	0.4375	6.1382	0.0185	2.0120	0.0115	2.0235	0.5336	0.0106	0.5442		1,846.522 9	1,846.522 9	0.0411		1,847.549 1

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

Page 26 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Mitigated	18.4058	109.4792	207.4799	0.9358	70.9408	0.5015	71.4423	18.9783	0.4674	19.4457		95,621.64 00	95,621.64 00	4.0728		95,723.45 95
Unmitigated	18.4058	109.4792	207.4799	0.9358	70.9408	0.5015	71.4423	18.9783	0.4674	19.4457		95,621.64 00	95,621.64 00	4.0728		95,723.45 95

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Ave	rage Daily Trip Ra	ate	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Apartments Low Rise	4,497.22	4,497.22	4497.22	15,882,078	15,882,078
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Regional Shopping Center	6,852.34	6,852.34	6852.34	17,386,330	17,386,330
Total	11,349.56	11,349.56	11,349.56	33,268,408	33,268,408

4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpos	e %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Apartments Low Rise	14.70	5.90	8.70	40.20	19.20	40.60	89	11	0
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	16.60	8.40	6.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Parking Lot	16.60	8.40	6.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Regional Shopping Center	16.60	8.40	6.90	16.30	64.70	19.00	65	35	0

4.4 Fleet Mix

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Apartments Low Rise	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898
Parking Lot	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898
Regional Shopping Center	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Install High Efficiency Lighting

Install Energy Efficient Appliances

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
NaturalGas Mitigated	0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6

Page 28 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Apartments Low Rise	27180.7	0.2931	2.5049	1.0659	0.0160		0.2025	0.2025		0.2025	0.2025		3,197.729 7	3,197.729 7	0.0613	0.0586	3,216.732 2
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	1498.12	0.0162	0.1469	0.1234	8.8000e- 004		0.0112	0.0112		0.0112	0.0112		176.2490	176.2490	3.3800e- 003	3.2300e- 003	177.2964
Total		0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6

Page 29 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Mitigated

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Apartments Low Rise	27.1807	0.2931	2.5049	1.0659	0.0160		0.2025	0.2025		0.2025	0.2025		3,197.729 7	3,197.729 7	0.0613	0.0586	3,216.732 2
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	1.49812	0.0162	0.1469	0.1234	8.8000e- 004	,	0.0112	0.0112		0.0112	0.0112		176.2490	176.2490	3.3800e- 003	3.2300e- 003	177.2964
Total		0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

Page 30 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Mitigated	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.711 0
Unmitigated	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.711 0

6.2 Area by SubCategory

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Architectural Coating	1.7830					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	17.7934					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	1.1129	9.5100	4.0468	0.0607		0.7689	0.7689		0.7689	0.7689	0.0000	12,140.47 06	12,140.47 06	0.2327	0.2226	12,212.61 53
Landscaping	1.5914	0.6067	52.6495	2.7800e- 003		0.2912	0.2912		0.2912	0.2912		94.8089	94.8089	0.0915		97.0957
Total	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.71 10

Page 31 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/o	day							lb/d	lay		
Architectural Coating	1.7830					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	17.7934		,			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	1.1129	9.5100	4.0468	0.0607		0.7689	0.7689		0.7689	0.7689	0.0000	12,140.47 06	12,140.47 06	0.2327	0.2226	12,212.61 53
Landscaping	1.5914	0.6067	52.6495	2.7800e- 003		0.2912	0.2912		0.2912	0.2912		94.8089	94.8089	0.0915		97.0957
Total	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.71 10

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

Install Low Flow Bathroom Faucet

Install Low Flow Kitchen Faucet

Install Low Flow Toilet

Install Low Flow Shower

Use Water Efficient Irrigation System

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

Page 32 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

Institute Recycling and Composting Services

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type Number Hours/Day Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
--	-------------	-------------	-----------

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
		1 ,	·	5	,

User Defined Equipment

Equipment Type Number

11.0 Vegetation

Page 1 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

Palomar Crossing

Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	6.50	Acre	6.50	283,140.00	0
Parking Lot	574.73	1000sqft	13.19	574,727.00	0
Apartments Low Rise	637.00	Dwelling Unit	17.66	637,000.00	1822
Regional Shopping Center	246.31	1000sqft	5.65	246,312.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.4	Precipitation Freq (Days)	28
Climate Zone	10			Operational Year	2023
Utility Company	Southern California Edisor	n			
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	702.44	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.029	N2O Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

8.120

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

Page 2 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Construction Phase - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Grading - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Architectural Coating - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Vehicle Trips - See SWAPE comment about trip purpose percentage.

Woodstoves - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Area Coating -

Land Use Change -

Sequestration - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Mobile Land Use Mitigation - See SWAPE about mobile mitigation measures.

Energy Mitigation - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Water Mitigation - Consistent with DEIR's model.

Waste Mitigation -

Page 3 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Exterior	100.00	10.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Interior	100.00	10.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Exterior	50.00	10.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Interior	50.00	10.00
tblConstDustMitigation	WaterUnpavedRoadVehicleSpeed	0	15
tblFireplaces	NumberGas	541.45	573.30
tblFireplaces	NumberWood	31.85	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	21.50
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	574,730.00	574,727.00
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	246,310.00	246,312.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	39.81	17.66
tblSequestration	NumberOfNewTrees	0.00	130.00
tblVehicleTrips	PB_TP	3.00	0.00
tblVehicleTrips	PB_TP	11.00	0.00
tblVehicleTrips	PR_TP	86.00	89.00
tblVehicleTrips	PR_TP	54.00	65.00
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	7.16	7.06
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	49.97	27.82
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	6.07	7.06
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	25.24	27.82
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	6.59	7.06
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	42.70	27.82
tblWoodstoves	NumberCatalytic	31.85	0.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberNoncatalytic	31.85	0.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

Page 4 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
2019	8.0628	54.5901	55.6725	0.1820	19.0275	2.3916	21.4191	10.0661	2.2003	12.2664	0.0000	18,402.59 62	18,402.59 62	1.9482	0.0000	18,439.94 02
2020	7.3271	47.4677	51.6268	0.1786	11.6320	1.3253	12.9573	3.1211	1.2474	4.3684	0.0000	18,026.98 53	18,026.98 53	1.4156	0.0000	18,062.37 55
2021	6.6963	42.7842	48.2374	0.1751	11.6320	1.0629	12.6949	3.1211	0.9989	4.1200	0.0000	17,679.03 51	17,679.03 51	1.3566	0.0000	17,712.95 00
2022	23.9734	39.3940	45.5841	0.1714	11.6319	0.9046	12.5365	3.1210	0.8506	3.9716	0.0000	17,309.83 75	17,309.83 75	1.3044	0.0000	17,342.44 68
Maximum	23.9734	54.5901	55.6725	0.1820	19.0275	2.3916	21.4191	10.0661	2.2003	12.2664	0.0000	18,402.59 62	18,402.59 62	1.9482	0.0000	18,439.94 02

Page 5 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Tota	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	[lb/	′day							lb/d	day		
2019	8.0628	54.5901	55.6725	0.1820	19.0275	2.3916	21.4191	10.0661	2.2003	12.2664	0.0000	18,402.59 62	18,402.59 62	1.9482	0.0000	18,439.94 02
2020	7.3271	47.4677	51.6268	0.1786	11.6320	1.3253	12.9573	3.1211	1.2474	4.3684	0.0000	18,026.98 53	18,026.98 53	1.4156	0.0000	18,062.37 55
2021	6.6963	42.7842	48.2374	0.1751	11.6320	1.0629	12.6949	3.1211	0.9989	4.1200	0.0000	17,679.03 51	17,679.03 51	1.3566	0.0000	17,712.95 00
2022	23.9734	39.3940	45.5841	0.1714	11.6319	0.9046	12.5365	3.1210	0.8506	3.9716	0.0000	17,309.83 75	17,309.83 75	1.3044	0.0000	17,342.44 68
Maximum	23.9734	54.5901	55.6725	0.1820	19.0275	2.3916	21.4191	10.0661	2.2003	12.2664	0.0000	18,402.59 62	18,402.59 62	1.9482	0.0000	18,439.94 02
	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Page 6 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Category	lb/day										lb/day						
Area	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.711 0	
Energy	0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6	
Mobile	15.3892	108.8628	179.9636	0.8631	70.9408	0.5050	71.4458	18.9783	0.4707	19.4491		88,309.78 53	88,309.78 53	4.1939		88,414.63 19	
Total	37.9791	121.6313	237.8492	0.9435	70.9408	1.7788	72.7197	18.9783	1.7446	20.7229	0.0000	103,919.0 436	103,919.0 436	4.5827	0.2844	104,118.3 716	

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Category	lb/day										lb/day						
Area	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.711 0	
Energy	0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6	
Mobile	15.3892	108.8628	179.9636	0.8631	70.9408	0.5050	71.4458	18.9783	0.4707	19.4491		88,309.78 53	88,309.78 53	4.1939		88,414.63 19	
Total	37.9791	121.6313	237.8492	0.9435	70.9408	1.7788	72.7197	18.9783	1.7446	20.7229	0.0000	103,919.0 436	103,919.0 436	4.5827	0.2844	104,118.3 716	

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	4/1/2019	5/10/2019	5	30	
2	Grading	Grading	5/11/2019	8/23/2019	5	75	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	8/24/2019	6/24/2022	5	740	
4	Paving	Paving	6/25/2022	9/9/2022	5	55	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	9/10/2022	11/25/2022	5	55	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 21.5

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 187.5

Acres of Paving: 19.69

Residential Indoor: 1,289,925; Residential Outdoor: 429,975; Non-Residential Indoor: 369,468; Non-Residential Outdoor: 123,156; Striped Parking Area: 51,472 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Page 8 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Grading	Excavators	2	8.00	158	0.38
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Grading	Scrapers	2	8.00	367	0.48
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Paving	Pavers	2	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	8.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	8	20.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	898.00	249.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	180.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

Page 9 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area

Reduce Vehicle Speed on Unpaved Roads

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Fugitive Dust					18.8263	0.0000	18.8263	10.0128	0.0000	10.0128			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.3350	45.5727	22.0630	0.0380		2.3904	2.3904		2.1991	2.1991		3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9	1.1917		3,796.244 5
Total	4.3350	45.5727	22.0630	0.0380	18.8263	2.3904	21.2166	10.0128	2.1991	12.2119		3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9	1.1917		3,796.244 5

Page 10 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0968	0.0630	0.6481	1.8400e- 003	0.2012	1.2400e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1400e- 003	0.0545		183.6931	183.6931	4.9800e- 003		183.8177
Total	0.0968	0.0630	0.6481	1.8400e- 003	0.2012	1.2400e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1400e- 003	0.0545		183.6931	183.6931	4.9800e- 003		183.8177

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Fugitive Dust					18.8263	0.0000	18.8263	10.0128	0.0000	10.0128			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.3350	45.5727	22.0630	0.0380		2.3904	2.3904		2.1991	2.1991	0.0000	3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9	1.1917		3,796.244 5
Total	4.3350	45.5727	22.0630	0.0380	18.8263	2.3904	21.2166	10.0128	2.1991	12.2119	0.0000	3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9	1.1917		3,796.244 5

Page 11 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0968	0.0630	0.6481	1.8400e- 003	0.2012	1.2400e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1400e- 003	0.0545		183.6931	183.6931	4.9800e- 003		183.8177
Total	0.0968	0.0630	0.6481	1.8400e- 003	0.2012	1.2400e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1400e- 003	0.0545		183.6931	183.6931	4.9800e- 003		183.8177

3.3 Grading - 2019

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust					8.6733	0.0000	8.6733	3.5965	0.0000	3.5965			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.7389	54.5202	33.3768	0.0620		2.3827	2.3827		2.1920	2.1920		6,140.019 5	6,140.019 5	1.9426		6,188.585 4
Total	4.7389	54.5202	33.3768	0.0620	8.6733	2.3827	11.0560	3.5965	2.1920	5.7885		6,140.019 5	6,140.019 5	1.9426		6,188.585 4

Page 12 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.3 Grading - 2019

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.1076	0.0700	0.7201	2.0500e- 003	0.2236	1.3800e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2700e- 003	0.0606		204.1034	204.1034	5.5400e- 003		204.2419
Total	0.1076	0.0700	0.7201	2.0500e- 003	0.2236	1.3800e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2700e- 003	0.0606		204.1034	204.1034	5.5400e- 003		204.2419

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust					8.6733	0.0000	8.6733	3.5965	0.0000	3.5965			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.7389	54.5202	33.3768	0.0620		2.3827	2.3827		2.1920	2.1920	0.0000	6,140.019 5	6,140.019 5	1.9426		6,188.585 4
Total	4.7389	54.5202	33.3768	0.0620	8.6733	2.3827	11.0560	3.5965	2.1920	5.7885	0.0000	6,140.019 5	6,140.019 5	1.9426		6,188.585 4

Page 13 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.3 Grading - 2019

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.1076	0.0700	0.7201	2.0500e- 003	0.2236	1.3800e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2700e- 003	0.0606		204.1034	204.1034	5.5400e- 003		204.2419
Total	0.1076	0.0700	0.7201	2.0500e- 003	0.2236	1.3800e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2700e- 003	0.0606		204.1034	204.1034	5.5400e- 003		204.2419

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Off-Road	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899		1.2127	1.2127		2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5
Total	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899		1.2127	1.2127		2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5

Page 14 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.8706	28.2800	6.1758	0.0631	1.5946	0.2180	1.8125	0.4591	0.2085	0.6676		6,646.772 1	6,646.772 1	0.6138		6,662.1160
Worker	4.8311	3.1411	32.3329	0.0920	10.0375	0.0620	10.0995	2.6620	0.0571	2.7191		9,164.244 0	9,164.244 0	0.2487		9,170.460 7
Total	5.7016	31.4211	38.5087	0.1551	11.6321	0.2799	11.9120	3.1211	0.2656	3.3867		15,811.01 61	15,811.01 61	0.8624		15,832.57 67

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899		1.2127	1.2127	0.0000	2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5
Total	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899		1.2127	1.2127	0.0000	2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5

Page 15 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.8706	28.2800	6.1758	0.0631	1.5946	0.2180	1.8125	0.4591	0.2085	0.6676		6,646.772 1	6,646.772 1	0.6138		6,662.1160
Worker	4.8311	3.1411	32.3329	0.0920	10.0375	0.0620	10.0995	2.6620	0.0571	2.7191		9,164.244 0	9,164.244 0	0.2487		9,170.460 7
Total	5.7016	31.4211	38.5087	0.1551	11.6321	0.2799	11.9120	3.1211	0.2656	3.3867		15,811.01 61	15,811.01 61	0.8624		15,832.57 67

3.4 Building Construction - 2020

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	lay							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	2.1198	19.1860	16.8485	0.0269		1.1171	1.1171		1.0503	1.0503		2,553.063 1	2,553.063 1	0.6229		2,568.634 5
Total	2.1198	19.1860	16.8485	0.0269		1.1171	1.1171		1.0503	1.0503		2,553.063 1	2,553.063 1	0.6229		2,568.634 5

Page 16 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2020

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.7321	25.4859	5.4880	0.0626	1.5945	0.1474	1.7419	0.4591	0.1411	0.6001		6,599.564 8	6,599.564 8	0.5723		6,613.873 1
Worker	4.4752	2.7958	29.2904	0.0891	10.0375	0.0608	10.0983	2.6620	0.0560	2.7180		8,874.357 4	8,874.357 4	0.2204		8,879.868 0
Total	5.2072	28.2817	34.7783	0.1517	11.6320	0.2082	11.8402	3.1211	0.1970	3.3181		15,473.92 22	15,473.92 22	0.7928		15,493.74 10

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Off-Road	2.1198	19.1860	16.8485	0.0269		1.1171	1.1171		1.0503	1.0503	0.0000	2,553.063 1	2,553.063 1	0.6229		2,568.634 5
Total	2.1198	19.1860	16.8485	0.0269		1.1171	1.1171		1.0503	1.0503	0.0000	2,553.063 1	2,553.063 1	0.6229		2,568.634 5

Page 17 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2020

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.7321	25.4859	5.4880	0.0626	1.5945	0.1474	1.7419	0.4591	0.1411	0.6001		6,599.564 8	6,599.564 8	0.5723		6,613.873 1
Worker	4.4752	2.7958	29.2904	0.0891	10.0375	0.0608	10.0983	2.6620	0.0560	2.7180		8,874.357 4	8,874.357 4	0.2204		8,879.868 0
Total	5.2072	28.2817	34.7783	0.1517	11.6320	0.2082	11.8402	3.1211	0.1970	3.3181		15,473.92 22	15,473.92 22	0.7928		15,493.74 10

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013		2,553.363 9	2,553.363 9	0.6160		2,568.764 3
Total	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013		2,553.363 9	2,553.363 9	0.6160		2,568.764 3

Page 18 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.6174	22.8438	4.8632	0.0621	1.5944	0.0452	1.6396	0.4591	0.0432	0.5023		6,548.033 2	6,548.033 2	0.5424		6,561.592 3
Worker	4.1780	2.5083	26.7990	0.0861	10.0375	0.0592	10.0967	2.6620	0.0545	2.7165		8,577.638 1	8,577.638 1	0.1982		8,582.593 4
Total	4.7954	25.3521	31.6622	0.1482	11.6320	0.1043	11.7363	3.1211	0.0976	3.2187		15,125.67 12	15,125.67 12	0.7406		15,144.18 57

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Off-Road	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013	0.0000	2,553.363 9	2,553.363 9	0.6160		2,568.764 3
Total	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013	0.0000	2,553.363 9	2,553.363 9	0.6160		2,568.764 3

Page 19 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.6174	22.8438	4.8632	0.0621	1.5944	0.0452	1.6396	0.4591	0.0432	0.5023		6,548.033 2	6,548.033 2	0.5424		6,561.592 3
Worker	4.1780	2.5083	26.7990	0.0861	10.0375	0.0592	10.0967	2.6620	0.0545	2.7165		8,577.638 1	8,577.638 1	0.1982		8,582.593 4
Total	4.7954	25.3521	31.6622	0.1482	11.6320	0.1043	11.7363	3.1211	0.0976	3.2187		15,125.67 12	15,125.67 12	0.7406		15,144.18 57

3.4 Building Construction - 2022

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612		2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2
Total	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612		2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2

Page 20 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2022

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.5765	21.5220	4.5397	0.0615	1.5944	0.0380	1.6324	0.4590	0.0364	0.4954		6,490.860 7	6,490.860 7	0.5142		6,503.715 4
Worker	3.9195	2.2564	24.6810	0.0829	10.0375	0.0576	10.0951	2.6620	0.0530	2.7150		8,264.643 2	8,264.643 2	0.1782		8,269.099 2
Total	4.4960	23.7784	29.2207	0.1444	11.6319	0.0956	11.7275	3.1210	0.0894	3.2104		14,755.50 39	14,755.50 39	0.6924		14,772.81 46

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Off-Road	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612	0.0000	2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2
Total	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612	0.0000	2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2

Page 21 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2022

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.5765	21.5220	4.5397	0.0615	1.5944	0.0380	1.6324	0.4590	0.0364	0.4954		6,490.860 7	6,490.860 7	0.5142		6,503.715 4
Worker	3.9195	2.2564	24.6810	0.0829	10.0375	0.0576	10.0951	2.6620	0.0530	2.7150		8,264.643 2	8,264.643 2	0.1782		8,269.099 2
Total	4.4960	23.7784	29.2207	0.1444	11.6319	0.0956	11.7275	3.1210	0.0894	3.2104		14,755.50 39	14,755.50 39	0.6924		14,772.81 46

3.5 Paving - 2022

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	1.1028	11.1249	14.5805	0.0228		0.5679	0.5679		0.5225	0.5225		2,207.660 3	2,207.660 3	0.7140		2,225.510 4
Paving	0.6283					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		,	0.0000			0.0000
Total	1.7311	11.1249	14.5805	0.0228		0.5679	0.5679		0.5225	0.5225		2,207.660 3	2,207.660 3	0.7140		2,225.510 4

Page 22 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.5 Paving - 2022

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0655	0.0377	0.4123	1.3800e- 003	0.1677	9.6000e- 004	0.1686	0.0445	8.9000e- 004	0.0454		138.0508	138.0508	2.9800e- 003		138.1253
Total	0.0655	0.0377	0.4123	1.3800e- 003	0.1677	9.6000e- 004	0.1686	0.0445	8.9000e- 004	0.0454		138.0508	138.0508	2.9800e- 003		138.1253

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Off-Road	1.1028	11.1249	14.5805	0.0228		0.5679	0.5679		0.5225	0.5225	0.0000	2,207.660 3	2,207.660 3	0.7140		2,225.510 4
Paving	0.6283					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	1.7311	11.1249	14.5805	0.0228		0.5679	0.5679		0.5225	0.5225	0.0000	2,207.660 3	2,207.660 3	0.7140		2,225.510 4

Page 23 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.5 Paving - 2022

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0655	0.0377	0.4123	1.3800e- 003	0.1677	9.6000e- 004	0.1686	0.0445	8.9000e- 004	0.0454		138.0508	138.0508	2.9800e- 003		138.1253
Total	0.0655	0.0377	0.4123	1.3800e- 003	0.1677	9.6000e- 004	0.1686	0.0445	8.9000e- 004	0.0454		138.0508	138.0508	2.9800e- 003		138.1253

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Archit. Coating	22.9832					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	23.1878	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

Page 24 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.7857	0.4523	4.9472	0.0166	2.0120	0.0115	2.0235	0.5336	0.0106	0.5442		1,656.610 0	1,656.610 0	0.0357		1,657.503 2
Total	0.7857	0.4523	4.9472	0.0166	2.0120	0.0115	2.0235	0.5336	0.0106	0.5442		1,656.610 0	1,656.610 0	0.0357		1,657.503 2

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Archit. Coating	22.9832					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	23.1878	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

Page 25 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.7857	0.4523	4.9472	0.0166	2.0120	0.0115	2.0235	0.5336	0.0106	0.5442		1,656.610 0	1,656.610 0	0.0357		1,657.503 2
Total	0.7857	0.4523	4.9472	0.0166	2.0120	0.0115	2.0235	0.5336	0.0106	0.5442		1,656.610 0	1,656.610 0	0.0357		1,657.503 2

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

Page 26 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day	-						lb/c	day		
Mitigated	15.3892	108.8628	179.9636	0.8631	70.9408	0.5050	71.4458	18.9783	0.4707	19.4491		88,309.78 53	88,309.78 53	4.1939		88,414.63 19
Unmitigated	15.3892	108.8628	179.9636	0.8631	70.9408	0.5050	71.4458	18.9783	0.4707	19.4491		88,309.78 53	88,309.78 53	4.1939		88,414.63 19

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Ave	rage Daily Trip Ra	ate	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Apartments Low Rise	4,497.22	4,497.22	4497.22	15,882,078	15,882,078
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Regional Shopping Center	6,852.34	6,852.34	6852.34	17,386,330	17,386,330
Total	11,349.56	11,349.56	11,349.56	33,268,408	33,268,408

4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpos	e %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Apartments Low Rise	14.70	5.90	8.70	40.20	19.20	40.60	89	11	0
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	16.60	8.40	6.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Parking Lot	16.60	8.40	6.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Regional Shopping Center	16.60	8.40	6.90	16.30	64.70	19.00	65	35	0

4.4 Fleet Mix

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Apartments Low Rise	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898
Parking Lot	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898
Regional Shopping Center	0.548600	0.036250	0.186898	0.112544	0.014284	0.004806	0.017604	0.070134	0.001409	0.001147	0.004508	0.000918	0.000898

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Install High Efficiency Lighting

Install Energy Efficient Appliances

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	lay							lb/c	lay		
	0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6

Page 28 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Apartments Low Rise	27180.7	0.2931	2.5049	1.0659	0.0160		0.2025	0.2025		0.2025	0.2025		3,197.729 7	3,197.729 7	0.0613	0.0586	3,216.732 2
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	1498.12	0.0162	0.1469	0.1234	8.8000e- 004		0.0112	0.0112		0.0112	0.0112		176.2490	176.2490	3.3800e- 003	3.2300e- 003	177.2964
Total		0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6

Page 29 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Mitigated

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Apartments Low Rise	27.1807	0.2931	2.5049	1.0659	0.0160		0.2025	0.2025		0.2025	0.2025		3,197.729 7	3,197.729 7	0.0613	0.0586	3,216.732 2
Other Non- Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	,,,,,,,	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	1.49812	0.0162	0.1469	0.1234	8.8000e- 004	,	0.0112	0.0112		0.0112	0.0112		176.2490	176.2490	3.3800e- 003	3.2300e- 003	177.2964
Total		0.3093	2.6518	1.1893	0.0169		0.2137	0.2137		0.2137	0.2137		3,373.978 8	3,373.978 8	0.0647	0.0619	3,394.028 6

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

Page 30 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Mitigated	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.711 0
Unmitigated	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.711 0

6.2 Area by SubCategory

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/o	day							lb/d	day		
Architectural Coating	1.7830					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	17.7934					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	1.1129	9.5100	4.0468	0.0607		0.7689	0.7689		0.7689	0.7689	0.0000	12,140.47 06	12,140.47 06	0.2327	0.2226	12,212.61 53
Landscaping	1.5914	0.6067	52.6495	2.7800e- 003		0.2912	0.2912		0.2912	0.2912		94.8089	94.8089	0.0915		97.0957
Total	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.71 10

Page 31 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
	1.7830					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
	17.7934					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	1.1129	9.5100	4.0468	0.0607		0.7689	0.7689		0.7689	0.7689	0.0000	12,140.47 06	12,140.47 06	0.2327	0.2226	12,212.61 53
Landscaping	1.5914	0.6067	52.6495	2.7800e- 003		0.2912	0.2912		0.2912	0.2912		94.8089	94.8089	0.0915		97.0957
Total	22.2807	10.1167	56.6963	0.0635		1.0601	1.0601		1.0601	1.0601	0.0000	12,235.27 95	12,235.27 95	0.3242	0.2226	12,309.71 10

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

Install Low Flow Bathroom Faucet

Install Low Flow Kitchen Faucet

Install Low Flow Toilet

Install Low Flow Shower

Use Water Efficient Irrigation System

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

Page 32 of 32

Palomar Crossing - Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

Institute Recycling and Composting Services

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type Number Hours/Day Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
--	-------------	-------------	-----------

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
		, ,	·	5	71

User Defined Equipment

Equipment Type Number

11.0 Vegetation

Start date and time 01/20/20 12:05:11

AERSCREEN 16216

Palomar Crossings Construction

Palomar Crossings Construction

----- DATA ENTRY VALIDATION ------

			METRIC	ENGLISH
**	AREADATA	**		

Emission Rate:	0.343E-02	g/s	0.272E-01	lb/hr
Area Height:	3.00	meters	9.84	feet
Area Source Length	: 498.00	meters	1633.86	feet
Area Source Width:	350.00	meters	1148.29	feet
Vertical Dimensior	: 1.50	meters	4.92	feet
Model Mode:	URBAN			
Population:	90595			
Dist to Ambient Ai	r:	1.0	meters	3. feet

** BUILDING DATA **

No Building Downwash Parameters

** TERRAIN DATA **

No Terrain Elevations

Source Base Elevation: 0.0 meters 0.0 feet

Probe distance: 5000. meters 16404. feet

No flagpole receptors

No discrete receptors used

** FUMIGATION DATA **

No fumigation requested

** METEOROLOGY DATA **

Min/Max Temperature: 250.0 / 310.0 K -9.7 / 98.3 Deg F

Minimum Wind Speed: 0.5 m/s

Anemometer Height: 10.000 meters

Dominant Surface Profile: Urban Dominant Climate Type: Average Moisture

Surface friction velocity (u*): not adjusted

DEBUG OPTION ON

AERSCREEN output file:

2020.01.20_Palomar_Construction.out

*** AERSCREEN Run is Ready to Begin

No terrain used, AERMAP will not be run

SURFACE CHARACTERISTICS & MAKEMET

Obtaining surface characteristics...

Using AERMET seasonal surface characteristics for Urban with Average Moisture

Season	Albedo	Во	zo
Winter	0.35	1.50	1.000
Spring	0.14	1.00	1.000
Summer	0.16	2.00	1.000
Autumn	0.18	2.00	1.000

Creating met files aerscreen_01_01.sfc & aerscreen_01_01.pfl

Creating met files aerscreen_02_01.sfc & aerscreen_02_01.pfl

Creating met files aerscreen_03_01.sfc & aerscreen_03_01.pfl

Creating met files aerscreen_04_01.sfc & aerscreen_04_01.pfl

Buildings and/or terrain present or rectangular area source, skipping probe

FLOWSECTOR started 01/20/20 12:06:48

Running AERMOD

Processing Winter

Processing surface roughness sector 1

Processing wind flow sector 1

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 0

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 2

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 5

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 3

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 10

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 15

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 5

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 20

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 6

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 25

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 7

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 30

****** WARNING MESSAGES ******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 8

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 35

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 9

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 40

******* WARNING MESSAGES ****** *** NONE *** *******

Running AERMOD

Processing Spring

Processing surface roughness sector 1

Processing wind flow sector 1

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 0

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 2

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 5

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 3

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 10

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 4

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 15

******** WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 5

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 20

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 6

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 25

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 7

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 30

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 8

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 35

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 9

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 40

******* WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Running AERMOD

Processing Summer

Processing surface roughness sector 1

Processing wind flow sector 1

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 0

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 2

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 5

******* WARNING MESSAGES *******

Processing wind flow sector 3

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 10

```
******* WARNING MESSAGES *******
*** NONE ***
```

Processing wind flow sector 4

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 15

**** WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 5

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 20

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******** *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 6

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 25 ******* WARNING MESSAGES ****** *** NONE *** Processing wind flow sector 7 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 30 ******* WARNING MESSAGES ****** *** NONE *** Processing wind flow sector 8 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 35 ******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE *** Processing wind flow sector 9 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 40

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE *** Running AERMOD Processing Autumn Processing surface roughness sector 1 ****** Processing wind flow sector 1 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 0 ****** WARNING MESSAGES ****** *** NONE *** ******* Processing wind flow sector 2 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 5 ******* WARNING MESSAGES ******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 3

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 10

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 4

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 15

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 5

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 20

****** WARNING MESSAGES ******

*** NONE ***

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 25

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 7

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 30

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 8

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 35

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 9

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 40

**** WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

FLOWSECTOR ended 01/20/20 12:07:16

REFINE started 01/20/20 12:07:16

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for REFINE stage 3 Winter sector 0

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

REFINE ended 01/20/20 12:07:19

AERSCREEN Finished Successfully

With no errors or warnings

Check log file for details

Ending date and time 01/20/20 12:07:21

Concentration Distance Elevation Diag Season/Month Zo sector Date HØ U* W* DT/DZ ZICNV ZIMCH M-O LEN ZØ BOWEN ALBEDO REF WS HT REF TA HT 0.79843E+00 1.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.82591E+00 25.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.85357E+00 50.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.87990E+00 75.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.90494E+00 100.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.92887E+00 125.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 150.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.95175E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.97386E+00 175.00 0.00 20.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.99593E+00 200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10173E+01 225.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10378E+01 250.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10494E+01 275.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10646E+01 300.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 * 0.10653E+01 301.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.82995E+00 325.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.70501E+00 350.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.63089E+00 375.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.59382E+00 400.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 425.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.54529E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.50555E+00 450.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.47325E+00 475.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 500.00 0.00 30.0 0.44597E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.42174E+00 525.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.39963E+00 550.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 575.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.37999E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.36221E+00 600.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.34631E+00 625.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.33227E+00 650.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.31932E+00 675.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.30801E+00 700.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.29761E+00 725.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.00 Winter 0.28776E+00 750.00 0-360 10011001 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.27839E+00 775.00 0.00 0.0

-1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.26955E+00 800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.26122E+00 825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.25327E+00 850.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.24574E+00 875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.23848E+00 900.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.23165E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 950.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.22521E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.21891E+00 975.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.21293E+00 1000.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.20728E+00 1025.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.20181E+00 1050.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.19661E+00 1075.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.19168E+00 1100.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.18694E+00 1125.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.18230E+00 1150.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.17786E+00 1175.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0

0.17364E+00 1200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.16962E+00 1225.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.16577E+00 1250.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.16200E+00 1275.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15837E+00 1300.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15487E+00 1325.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15151E+00 1350.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14830E+00 1375.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14520E+00 1400.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14217E+00 1425.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13925E+00 1450.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13645E+00 1475.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13376E+00 1500.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13116E+00 1525.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12863E+00 1550.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12619E+00 1575.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12378E+00 1600.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12145E+00 1625.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.11921E+00 1650.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.11704E+00 1675.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.11495E+00 1700.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.11293E+00 1725.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.11098E+00 1750.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10909E+00 1775.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10726E+00 1800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10546E+00 1825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.10368E+00 1850.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10195E+00 1875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10027E+00 1900.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.98650E-01 1925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.97076E-01 1950.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.95549E-01 1975.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.94062E-01 2000.00 0.00 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.92620E-01 2025.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001

-1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.91219E-01 2050.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.89858E-01 2075.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.88534E-01 2100.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.87234E-01 2125.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.85956E-01 2150.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.84711E-01 2175.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.83499E-01 2200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.82320E-01 2225.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.81164E-01 2250.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.80029E-01 2275.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.78923E-01 2300.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.77845E-01 2325.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.76793E-01 2350.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.75768E-01 2375.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.74767E-01 2400.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.73791E-01 2425.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0

0.72837E-01 2450.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.71906E-01 2475.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.70997E-01 2500.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.70109E-01 2525.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.69227E-01 2550.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.68364E-01 2575.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.67520E-01 2600.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.66695E-01 2625.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.65888E-01 2650.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.65099E-01 2675.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.64327E-01 2700.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.63571E-01 2725.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.62832E-01 2750.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.62108E-01 2775.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.61399E-01 2800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.60705E-01 2825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.60017E-01 2850.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.59342E-01 2875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.58680E-01 2900.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.58032E-01 2925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.57397E-01 2950.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.56774E-01 2975.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.56163E-01 3000.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.55564E-01 3025.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.54977E-01 3050.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.54400E-01 3075.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.53835E-01 3100.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.53276E-01 3125.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.52723E-01 3150.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.52179E-01 3175.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.51646E-01 3200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.51122E-01 3225.00 0.00 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.50608E-01 3250.00 0.00 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.50103E-01 3275.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001

-1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.49608E-01 3300.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.49123E-01 3325.00 0.00 Winter 0-360 10011001 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.48646E-01 3350.00 0.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.48177E-01 3375.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.47715E-01 3400.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.47259E-01 3425.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.46810E-01 3450.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.46368E-01 3475.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.45937E-01 3500.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.45512E-01 3525.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.45095E-01 3550.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.44684E-01 3575.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.44280E-01 3600.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.43882E-01 3625.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.43491E-01 3650.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.43106E-01 3675.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0

0.42728E-01 3700.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.42352E-01 3725.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.41981E-01 3750.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.41616E-01 3775.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.41256E-01 3800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.40902E-01 3825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.40554E-01 3850.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.40210E-01 3875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.39872E-01 3900.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.39539E-01 3925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.39211E-01 3950.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.38887E-01 3975.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.38568E-01 4000.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.38250E-01 4025.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.37937E-01 4050.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.37628E-01 4075.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.37324E-01 4100.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.37023E-01 4125.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.36728E-01 4150.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.36436E-01 4175.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.36148E-01 4200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.35865E-01 4225.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.35585E-01 4250.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.35311E-01 4275.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.35041E-01 4300.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.34774E-01 4325.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.34511E-01 4350.00 0.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.34251E-01 4375.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.33993E-01 4400.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.33739E-01 4425.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.33488E-01 4450.00 0.00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.33241E-01 4475.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.00 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.32996E-01 4500.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.32755E-01 4525.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001

-1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.32517E-01 4550.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.32282E-01 4575.00 0.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.32049E-01 4600.00 0.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.31819E-01 4625.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.31592E-01 4650.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.31367E-01 4675.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.31146E-01 4700.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.30927E-01 4725.00 0.00 Winter 5.0 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.30711E-01 4750.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.30498E-01 4775.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.30288E-01 4800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.30081E-01 4825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.29876E-01 4850.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.29674E-01 4875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.29474E-01 4900.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.29276E-01 4925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0

0.29081E-01 4950.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.28888E-01 4975.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.28698E-01 5000.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Start date and time 01/20/20 12:08:00

AERSCREEN 16216

Palomar Crossings Operation

Palomar Crossings Operation

----- DATA ENTRY VALIDATION ------

			METRIC	ENGLISH
**	AREADATA	**		

Emission Rate:	0.508E-02	g/s	0.403E-01	lb/hr
Area Height:	3.00	meters	9.84	feet
Area Source Lengt	h: 498.00	meters	1633.86	feet
Area Source Width	: 350.00	meters	1148.29	feet
Vertical Dimension	n: 1.50	meters	4.92	feet
Model Mode:	URBAN			
Population:	90595			
Dist to Ambient A	1.0	meters	3. feet	

** BUILDING DATA **

No Building Downwash Parameters

** TERRAIN DATA **

No Terrain Elevations

Source Base Elevation: 0.0 meters 0.0 feet

Probe distance: 5000. meters 16404. feet

No flagpole receptors

No discrete receptors used

** FUMIGATION DATA **

No fumigation requested

** METEOROLOGY DATA **

Min/Max Temperature: 250.0 / 310.0 K -9.7 / 98.3 Deg F

Minimum Wind Speed: 0.5 m/s

Anemometer Height: 10.000 meters

Dominant Surface Profile: Urban Dominant Climate Type: Average Moisture

Surface friction velocity (u*): not adjusted

DEBUG OPTION ON

AERSCREEN output file:

2020.01.20_Palomar_Operation.out

*** AERSCREEN Run is Ready to Begin

No terrain used, AERMAP will not be run

SURFACE CHARACTERISTICS & MAKEMET

Obtaining surface characteristics...

Using AERMET seasonal surface characteristics for Urban with Average Moisture

Season	Albedo	Во	zo
Winter	0.35	1.50	1.000
Spring	0.14	1.00	1.000
Summer	0.16	2.00	1.000
Autumn	0.18	2.00	1.000

Creating met files aerscreen_01_01.sfc & aerscreen_01_01.pfl

Creating met files aerscreen_02_01.sfc & aerscreen_02_01.pfl

Creating met files aerscreen_03_01.sfc & aerscreen_03_01.pfl

Creating met files aerscreen_04_01.sfc & aerscreen_04_01.pfl

Buildings and/or terrain present or rectangular area source, skipping probe

FLOWSECTOR started 01/20/20 12:09:04

Running AERMOD

Processing Winter

Processing surface roughness sector 1

Processing wind flow sector 1

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 0

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 2

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 5

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 3

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 10

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 15

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 5

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 20

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 6

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 25

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 7

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 30

****** WARNING MESSAGES ******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 8

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 35

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 9

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Winter sector 40

******* WARNING MESSAGES ****** *** NONE *** *******

Running AERMOD

Processing Spring

Processing surface roughness sector 1

Processing wind flow sector 1

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 0

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 2

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 5

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 3

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 10

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 4

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 15

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 5

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 20

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 6

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 25

****** WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 7

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 30

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 8

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 35

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 9

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Spring sector 40

******* WARNING MESSAGES *******

*** NONE ***

Running AERMOD

Processing Summer

Processing surface roughness sector 1

Processing wind flow sector 1

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 0

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 2

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 5

******* WARNING MESSAGES *******

Processing wind flow sector 3

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 10

```
******* WARNING MESSAGES *******
*** NONE ***
```

Processing wind flow sector 4

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 15

**** WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 5

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 20

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******** *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 6

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 25 ******* WARNING MESSAGES ****** *** NONE *** Processing wind flow sector 7 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 30 ******* WARNING MESSAGES ****** *** NONE *** Processing wind flow sector 8 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 35 ******* WARNING MESSAGES ****** *** NONE *** Processing wind flow sector 9 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Summer sector 40

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE *** Running AERMOD Processing Autumn Processing surface roughness sector 1 ****** Processing wind flow sector 1 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 0 ****** WARNING MESSAGES ****** *** NONE *** ******* Processing wind flow sector 2 AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 5 ******* WARNING MESSAGES ******

*** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 3

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 10

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 4

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 15

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 5

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 20

****** WARNING MESSAGES ******

*** NONE ***

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 25

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 7

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 30

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 8

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 35

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

Processing wind flow sector 9

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for FLOWSECTOR stage 2 Autumn sector 40

**** WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

FLOWSECTOR ended 01/20/20 12:09:31

REFINE started 01/20/20 12:09:31

AERMOD Finishes Successfully for REFINE stage 3 Winter sector 0

******* WARNING MESSAGES ******* *** NONE ***

REFINE ended 01/20/20 12:09:35

AERSCREEN Finished Successfully

With no errors or warnings

Check log file for details

Ending date and time 01/20/20 12:09:36

Concentration Distance Elevation Diag Season/Month Zo sector Date HØ U* W* DT/DZ ZICNV ZIMCH M-O LEN ZØ BOWEN ALBEDO REF WS HT REF TA HT 0.11812E+01 1.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12219E+01 25.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12628E+01 50.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13017E+01 75.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13388E+01 100.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13742E+01 125.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14080E+01 150.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14408E+01 175.00 0.00 20.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14734E+01 200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15050E+01 225.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15353E+01 250.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15524E+01 275.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15750E+01 300.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 * 0.15761E+01 301.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12278E+01 325.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10430E+01 350.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.93336E+00 375.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.87852E+00 400.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 425.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.80672E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.74792E+00 450.00 0.00 35.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.70014E+00 475.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 500.00 0.00 30.0 0.65979E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.62393E+00 525.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.59122E+00 550.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 575.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.56217E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.53587E+00 600.00 0.00 30.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.51235E+00 625.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.49157E+00 650.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.47241E+00 675.00 0.00 25.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.45568E+00 700.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.44029E+00 725.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.00 Winter 0.42572E+00 750.00 0-360 10011001 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.41186E+00 775.00 0.00 0.0

-1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.39878E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.38646E+00 825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.37470E+00 850.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.36356E+00 875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.35281E+00 900.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.34271E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 950.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.33318E+00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.32386E+00 975.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.31501E+00 1000.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.30665E+00 1025.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.29857E+00 1050.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.29087E+00 1075.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.28358E+00 1100.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.27656E+00 1125.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.26970E+00 1150.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.26314E+00 1175.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0

0.25689E+00 1200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.25094E+00 1225.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.24524E+00 1250.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.23967E+00 1275.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.23430E+00 1300.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.22912E+00 1325.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.22415E+00 1350.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.21940E+00 1375.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.21482E+00 1400.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.21032E+00 1425.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.20601E+00 1450.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.20187E+00 1475.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.19789E+00 1500.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.19405E+00 1525.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.19030E+00 1550.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.18668E+00 1575.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.18312E+00 1600.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.17968E+00 1625.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.17636E+00 1650.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.17316E+00 1675.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.17006E+00 1700.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.16707E+00 1725.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.16418E+00 1750.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.16138E+00 1775.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15868E+00 1800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15602E+00 1825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.15338E+00 1850.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.15082E+00 1875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14835E+00 1900.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14594E+00 1925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14362E+00 1950.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.14136E+00 1975.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13916E+00 2000.00 0.00 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13702E+00 2025.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001

-1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13495E+00 2050.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.13294E+00 2075.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.13098E+00 2100.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12906E+00 2125.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12717E+00 2150.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12532E+00 2175.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12353E+00 2200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12179E+00 2225.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.12008E+00 2250.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.11840E+00 2275.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.11676E+00 2300.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.11517E+00 2325.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.11361E+00 2350.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.11209E+00 2375.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.11061E+00 2400.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10917E+00 2425.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0

0.10776E+00 2450.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.10638E+00 2475.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10503E+00 2500.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10372E+00 2525.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10242E+00 2550.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.10114E+00 2575.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.99891E-01 2600.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.98670E-01 2625.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.97477E-01 2650.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.96309E-01 2675.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.95167E-01 2700.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.94049E-01 2725.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.92955E-01 2750.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.91884E-01 2775.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.90836E-01 2800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.89809E-01 2825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.88790E-01 2850.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.87792E-01 2875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.86813E-01 2900.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.85854E-01 2925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.84914E-01 2950.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.83993E-01 2975.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.83089E-01 3000.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.82203E-01 3025.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.81334E-01 3050.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.80482E-01 3075.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.79645E-01 3100.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.78819E-01 3125.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.78000E-01 3150.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.77196E-01 3175.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.76407E-01 3200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.75632E-01 3225.00 0.00 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.74871E-01 3250.00 0.00 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.74124E-01 3275.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001

-1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.73392E-01 3300.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.72674E-01 3325.00 0.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.71968E-01 3350.00 0.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.71275E-01 3375.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.70591E-01 3400.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.69916E-01 3425.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.69252E-01 3450.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.68599E-01 3475.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.67960E-01 3500.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.67332E-01 3525.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.66714E-01 3550.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.66107E-01 3575.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.65509E-01 3600.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.64921E-01 3625.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.64342E-01 3650.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.63773E-01 3675.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0

0.63212E-01 3700.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.62657E-01 3725.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.62109E-01 3750.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.61568E-01 3775.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.61036E-01 3800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.60512E-01 3825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.59997E-01 3850.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.59489E-01 3875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.58988E-01 3900.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.58495E-01 3925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.58010E-01 3950.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.57531E-01 3975.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.57059E-01 4000.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.56589E-01 4025.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.56125E-01 4050.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.55668E-01 4075.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.55218E-01 4100.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.54774E-01 4125.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.54336E-01 4150.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.53905E-01 4175.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.53479E-01 4200.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.53060E-01 4225.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.52646E-01 4250.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.52240E-01 4275.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.51840E-01 4300.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.51446E-01 4325.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.51057E-01 4350.00 0.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.50672E-01 4375.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.50290E-01 4400.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.49915E-01 4425.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.49543E-01 4450.00 0.00 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.49177E-01 4475.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.48815E-01 4500.00 0.00 Winter 0-360 10011001 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.48459E-01 4525.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001

-1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.48106E-01 4550.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.47759E-01 4575.00 0.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.47414E-01 4600.00 0.00 5.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.47074E-01 4625.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.46738E-01 4650.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.46406E-01 4675.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.46078E-01 4700.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.45754E-01 4725.00 0.00 Winter 5.0 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.45435E-01 4750.00 0.00 5.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.45120E-01 4775.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.44809E-01 4800.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.44502E-01 4825.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.44200E-01 4850.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.43900E-01 4875.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 0.43605E-01 4900.00 0.00 0.0 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.43312E-01 4925.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0

0.43024E-01 4950.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.42738E-01 4975.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0 0.42456E-01 5000.00 0.00 0.0 Winter 0-360 10011001 -1.30 0.043 -9.000 0.020 -999. 21. 6.0 1.000 1.50 0.35 0.50 10.0 310.0 2.0