

## **Los Angeles Regional Public Workshop on the Draft California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen)**

Tuesday, August 21, 2012

Friends of Bannings Landing Center, East Water Street, Wilmington, CA 90744

The first regional workshop in Los Angeles attracted about 30 participants that included local residents and business and government representatives. Members of Coalition for a Safe Environment, Communities for a Better Environment, and California Communities Against Toxics, and representatives from the ports and airport were present along with a few local developers. Governmental representatives from the US Environmental Protection Agency, the state Attorney General's office, and the county sanitation department also participated.

Staff sought comments and suggestions related to the overall approach taken and specifically on proposed indicators, data sources, and the methodology. Numerous comments were made at the workshop and are grouped and described below. Comments made more than once were consolidated and placed in the most appropriate category.

### Methods/General:

- Prefer census tract over ZIP code
- Need a more refined approach
- Concerns over proximity to hazards
- Land use should be included
- How are the ZIP codes determined?
- Dislike use of ZIP code, unsure if evenly distributed throughout the state
- There needs to be a regional analysis instead of statewide
- ZIP code is too big
- Concern regarding issues of concentration releases in urban areas
- Some errors on draft document maps
- Issues/questions for county data
- Concerns about weighted facilities within each indicator
- How does this compare with Environmental Justice Screening Method (EJSM)?
- Gradient of pollution in different places may not be correct because of limited air monitoring
- Additional monitoring is needed
- Method needs to be able to differentiate the impacts in different areas like Wilmington, Boyle Heights, and San Bernardino
- Consider ambient emissions, chemical emissions, wind patterns

- More outreach should have been done to alert people to meetings (library, neighborhood council, schools, local media)
- Where is the precautionary language? Needs to be included
- Great meeting but be aware that there is no local bus service to Bannings Landing

Exposures:

- Diesel should be included
- Ultra-fine particles should be monitored and included
- Concerns that small roads that are heavily used, especially in LA, may not be represented
- Quality of traffic should be considered
- Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) only contains stationary releases of toxics; mobile releases of toxics should be considered
- For TRI releases to air, a 1 kilometer buffer may not be appropriate. Should consider alternative
- Concerns over how TRI is measured because it does not measure emissions, only estimates them. Should be caveated.
- The data should be updated to be able to track sources of pollution
- Synergistic effects should be considered
- TRI indicator needs to be up to date because facility emissions can change drastically year to year
- Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) should be included
- Toxicity weighting for TRI is out of date and should not be used
- Pesticide indicator should be hazard weighted, there is data from US EPA Office of Pesticide Programs
- TRI emission factors (AP 42) may not be correct
- Is there a way to get type of traffic (specifically trucks) in the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) traffic data?

Public Health Effects:

- Consider alcoholism rates
- Consider drug use
- Consider respiratory illnesses like bronchitis, chronic sinusitis, and pneumonia (2)
- Consider smoking rates
- Consider autism rates
- Consider people who live near freeways

- Consider that some people are genetically more prone to heart disease
- Conduct a sensitivity analysis of the cofactors for public health indicators
- Consider women of child-bearing age
- Consider preterm births
- Consider life expectancy
- Improvements that would improve asthma rates may experience a lag
- Causes of heart disease are not entirely environmental
- Diabetes frequently in areas of highest pollution
- Should do more research on link between heart disease and quality of community
- How is the public health data collected? Door to door?
- Look at lead poisoning-important in transportation corridors, rail yards, etc.
- Should use a ranking of 1-10 for public health component
- Consider effects of petroleum industry
- Make sure to use accurate and complete info
- Identify data gaps and try to fill in
- Identify intergenerational spaces
- Consider incidence of epilepsy
- Consider birth defects
- Consider health issues like Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD)
- Consider incidence of childhood cancers (European report)
- Is mortality really a good predictor of heart disease?
- Consider effects on vision from proximity to sources of pollution
- Consider neurological effects
- Include infant mortality
- Should consider incidences not mortality rates

#### Environmental Effects:

- Environmental Effects component needs to have data on underground pipelines
- How do you model the worst case scenario instead of averaging?
- Environmental effects are not accurately displayed in the community of Rosamond
- Environmental Effects component score needs to be 1-10
- Don't use the language "Effects"
- Not enough data in Environmental Effects component, all needs to be released to public
- Are US EPA superfund program sites included?
- Supervised, in-compliance sites should be weighted lower than abandoned sites
- What is prevalent factor causing negative health effects?

- How do you account for community proximity to brownfields?
- "Leaking" Underground Storage Tanks (LUSTs) implies all facilities in indicator are leaking -- inaccurate interpretation
- Are inactive solid waste sites weighted the same as ones that are accepting waste?
- Caution should be taken in reducing weighting of Environmental Effects component; there are peer reviewed studies on stressor from environmental effects on public health
- Petroleum is not listed on the Environmental Effects component

#### Socioeconomic Factors and Sensitive Populations:

- Consider linguistic isolation as an indicator
- Hazard info and environmental info should be given out in Spanish too
- Children's sensitivities should be more accounted for
- Talk about studies that show a link between SES/sensitive populations to vulnerability
- How are the income & poverty indicators influenced by affordable housing?
- Good things about the community are not factored in
- Consider sensitive areas like food deserts
- Should look at proximity of schools to hazardous sites
- Consider consumer spending
- Consider food stamp use
- Consider political affiliation
- Consider marriage rates or prevalence of single mothers
- Consider section 8 vouchers
- Consider number of years of living in the US
- Need high school education just to be competitive, to earn living wage, to raise family
- Consider unemployment rate
- Consider rates of gang activity, domestic violence
- Consider history of incarceration
- Do unemployed community members have higher rates of health issues like obesity, heart disease, etc.?
- Should consider prevalence and age of pregnant teens

#### Use of Tool:

- Understand environmental problems- port, refineries, extreme asthma rates, premature births, cancer, allergies, respiratory illness, lupus
- Should use in siting, permitting, and planning

- Community benefits
- Use for enforcement
- Inform land use policies
- How will this tool impact where affordable housing projects are sited?
- Pollution prevention
- Creating change in communities
- Designating green zones
- Incorporating additional indicators in the revision
- Education (youth): helping students become critical thinkers
- Capacity building
- Enabling active participation in the community
- Bringing it back home (students to parents)
- Spark community involvement
- Informing politicians of the identified impacted communities
- Needs to be accurate, complete, comprehensive
- Use to identify data gaps and the leadership to get additional data
- Public depends on the leadership of government: be sure to get public comment for new projects
- Can help break the dependency between communities and pollution sources
- Identifying zones can lead to community empowerment
- Can promote community spaces
- Get support for impacted communities
- Reminder that definition of cumulative impacts under CEQA is different than definition used here
- When projects go through CEQA, Cal/EPA should give comments
- Use to educate cities for their general plans
- Communities that show up as less impacted overall might think they have nothing that needs changing