

Note to Reader: This administrative draft document is being released prior to the public draft version that will be released for formal public review and comment later in 2018. The administrative draft incorporates comments by the lead agencies on prior versions, but has not been reviewed or approved by the lead agencies for adequacy in meeting the requirements of CEQA or NEPA. All members of the public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the public draft. Responses will be prepared only on comments submitted during the formal public review and comment period on the Supplemental EIR/EIS information.

Appendix 22A

Air Quality Analysis Methodology

1

2

Appendix 22A

Air Quality Analysis Methodology

This appendix discusses the approach and methodology used to assess construction emissions associated with the proposed project. The analysis evaluates maximum daily and yearly emissions to comply with CEQA and NEPA guidelines in the Plan Area. Emissions analyzed include criteria pollutants and GHGs (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, and SF₆).

Construction activities associated with each proposed project component include demolition, excavation, paving, concrete batching, employee and vehicle travel, and offroad equipment operation. Several components also require the use of locomotives and marine vessels. Each of these activities was considered to evaluate the regional and localized air quality effects during construction of the project. Analysts also quantified emissions from geotechnical explorations, temporary and permanent utility construction, hauling of the precast tunnel segments, and material delivery. The following sections describe the quantification methodology.

22A.1 Construction Schedule

The analysis evaluates air quality and GHG effects from construction of the proposed project. Construction of the proposed project would occur between 2021 and 2031. Geotechnical explorations and temporary utilities would occur between 2018 and 2021 and 2019 and 2022, respectively. During peak construction periods, work would occur at several locations within the Plan Area, with overlapping construction of various project components. Working hours and workers present at any time would vary, depending on the activities being performed. Table 22B-1 in Appendix 22B, *Air Quality Assumptions* provides the construction schedule.

22A.2 Models and Methods for Emissions Quantification

Construction of the project would generate emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, and SF₆ that could result in short-term air quality and GHG effects. Emissions would originate from off-road equipment, employee and haul truck vehicles (“on-road vehicles”), marine vessels, helicopters, locomotives, earth moving activities, concrete batching, demolition, paving, and electricity consumption. These emissions would be temporary (i.e., limited to the construction period) and would cease when construction activities are complete.

The methods applied to the quantifying criteria pollutant and GHG emissions from construction of the proposed project are similar to the approaches used to analyze the approved project in the Final EIR/EIS. Combustion exhaust, fugitive dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and fugitive off-gassing (ROG) were estimated using a combination of emission factors and methodologies from CalEEMod, version 2016.3.2; CARB’s EMFAC2017 model¹; and the EPA’s *AP-42 Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission*

¹ EPA approval of EMFAC2017 is forthcoming and expected prior to the record of decision for the proposed project (December 2018).

1 Factors (AP-42) based on project-specific construction data (e.g., schedule, equipment, truck
2 volumes) provided by the project engineer (Gillespie pers. comm.). The following sections describe
3 the quantification approach for each of the primary emission sources. Tables 22B-2 through 22B-12
4 in Appendix 22B, *Air Quality Assumptions* provide the modeling inputs for each emission source.

5 **22A.2.1 Off-Road Equipment**

6 Emission factors for off-road construction equipment (e.g., loaders, graders, bulldozers) were
7 obtained from the CalEEMod (version 2016.3.2) User's Guide appendix, which provides values per
8 unit of activity (in grams per horsepower-hour) (Trinity Consultants 2017).² Pollutants were
9 estimated by multiplying the CalEEMod emission factors by the equipment inventory provided by
10 the project engineer (Gillespie pers. comm.). The equipment inventory is comprised of model
11 specific (e.g., CAT 963) equipment names, rather than generic operating types (e.g., bulldozer). To
12 estimate emissions using CalEEMod emission factors, which are given for generic equipment,
13 individual equipment provided by the project engineer was assigned a generic type based on the
14 model description, industry resources, and professional experience.

15 The analysis of off-road equipment includes emissions from diesel equipment. Tunnel boring
16 machines, tunnel fans, tunnel lights, certain air compressors, and pumps were assumed to be electric
17 and were included in the electricity analysis (refer to Section 22A.1.2.10). Accessory equipment (e.g.,
18 trailers, clamshell bucket) with no engines or emissions-generating components were excluded from
19 the analysis.

20 **22A.2.2 On-Road Vehicles**

21 On-road vehicles include vehicles used for material and equipment hauling, tunnel segment hauling,
22 employee commuting, onsite crew and material movement, and as-needed supply and equipment
23 pick-up. Exhaust emissions from on-road vehicles were estimated using the EMFAC2017 emissions
24 model and activity data provided by the project engineers (Gillespie pers. comm.; Valles pers.
25 comm.).³

26 Emission factors for haul trucks are based on aggregated-speed emission rates for EMFAC's T7
27 Single vehicle category. Equipment and materials delivered to the project site will likely originate in
28 the Bay Area, Sacramento, or Stockton. As a reasonable, yet conservative assumption, it was
29 assumed all equipment and material would be delivered from the Port of San Francisco (greatest
30 distance from the project area). Tunnel segments were assumed to originate from three offsite
31 casting yards, two of which would be located in the Bay Area and one would be located in Stockton.
32 Trip distances (miles) from each casting yard were quantified using GoogleEarth.

33 Emission factors for on-site water, fuel, and concrete trucks were based on 5 miles per hour (mph)
34 emission rates for the T6 Heavy vehicle category. Factors for on-site dump and utility/mechanic
35 trucks were based on 5 mph emission rates for the T7 Single and T6 Utility vehicle categories,
36 respectively. Emission factors for as-needed supply and equipment pick-up are based on weighted

² CalEEMod does not include emission factors for N₂O. Emissions of N₂O were determined by scaling CO₂ emissions by the ratio of N₂O/CO₂ (0.000025) emissions expected per gallon of diesel fuel according to the Climate Registry (2017).

³ EMFAC does not include emission factors for HFC-134a from onboard air condition systems. Emissions of HFC-134a were determined by scaling CO₂ emissions by the ratio of HFC-134a/CO₂ (0.026) emissions, as reported in the United States national inventory (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2017).

1 average vehicle speeds for EMFAC's light-duty automobile (LDA)/light-duty truck (LDT)/T7 vehicle
2 categories. All as-needed vehicle trips would be made to hardware or other local supply stores. An
3 average one-way trip distance of 10 miles was assumed, consistent with the Final EIR/EIS.

4 Emission factors for employee commute vehicles are based on a weighted average for all vehicle
5 speeds for EMFAC's LDA/LDT vehicle categories. One-way employee commute trip lengths were
6 provided by DWR based on a geospatial analysis of labor densities in the Plan Area.

7 Fugitive re-entrained road dust emissions for all vehicle types were estimated using the EPA's AP-
8 42, Sections 13.2.1 and 13.2.2 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2006a, 2011).

9 **22A.2.3 Marine Vessels**

10 Marine vessels used during construction include workboats, passenger boats, and tugboats. Criteria
11 pollutant emissions from marine vessels were quantified using CARB's (2012) *Emissions Estimation*
12 *Methodology for Commercial Harbor Craft Operating in California* (Harbor Craft Methodology) and
13 activity data provided by the project engineers (Gillespie pers. comm.; Valles pers. comm.). The
14 Harbor Craft Methodology is based on a zero-hour emission rate for the engine model year in the
15 absence of any malfunction or tampering of engine components that can change emissions, plus a
16 deterioration rate.⁴ The deterioration rate reflects the fact that base emissions of engines change as
17 the equipment is used due to wear of various engine parts or reduced efficiency of emission control
18 devices.⁵

19 **22A.2.4 Helicopters**

20 Helicopters would be used during line stringing activities for the permeant power reconductoring
21 work. Helicopter emissions were estimated using emission factors from the Federal Aviation
22 Administration's (FAA) Emissions and Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS), version 5.1.4, and
23 supplemental information from the EPA (1985), FAA (2012), and MD Helicopters (2014).

24 **22A.2.5 Locomotives**

25 Small, mining-type locomotives would be used to convey excavated material and personnel in rail
26 cars through the tunnel alignments. CARB's (2010) off-road diesel engine standards were used to
27 quantify regulated criteria pollutant emissions (ROG, NO_x, CO, and PM). The emission standards are
28 defined per unit of activity (in grams per horsepower-hour) by engine tier (e.g., Tier 4). SO_x
29 emissions were calculated based on a diesel fuel density of 3,200 grams per gallon and a sulfur
30 content of 15 parts per million sulfur, consistent with CARB and EPA requirements. Unlike criteria
31 pollutants, there are no federal or state GHG standards for locomotives. Accordingly, CO₂, CH₄ and
32 N₂O were calculated using emission factors from the Port of Long Beach (2016), which are based on
33 fuel-specific combustion rates for each pollutant.

⁴ Emission deterioration is capped at 12,000 hours of operation per CARB methodology.

⁵ CARB's deterioration factors, useful life, and zero-hour emission factors were used for all pollutants except SO_x. SO_x emissions were quantified based on brake-specific fuel consumption and a sulfur fuel content of 15 parts per million, which is the sulfur content limit for California harbor craft, in accordance with California Diesel Fuel Regulations.

1 **22A.2.6 Earth Movement**

2 Fugitive dust emissions from earth movement (i.e., site grading, bulldozing, excavation, dredging,
3 and truck loading) were quantified using emission factors from the CalEEMod User's Guide (Trinity
4 Consultants 2017). Striping acres and borrowed, excavated, and dredged quantities were provided
5 by the project engineer (Gillespie pers. comm.). Bulldozing equipment hours were obtained from the
6 off-road equipment inventory.

7 **22A.2.7 Concrete Batching**

8 Concrete required to construct the water conveyance facility will be manufactured at batch plants
9 that store, convey, and discharge water, cement, fine aggregate, and coarse aggregate. Fugitive dust
10 emissions⁶ from concrete batching at the five new temporary batch plants⁷ were quantified using
11 the EPA's AP-42, Sections 11.12 and 13.2.4, and required concrete quantities provided by the project
12 engineer (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2006b, 2006c; Gillespie pers. comm.). Emissions
13 from wind erosion assumed an average stockpile size of 15 acres at each batch plant.

14 CO₂ emissions generated by cement manufacturing were calculated based on the anticipated volume
15 of required concrete at various compression strengths. Based on data provided by DWR, structural
16 components would require compression strength between 3,000 and 4,000 pounds per square inch
17 (psi), whereas the tunnel segments would require strength between 6,000 and 8,000 psi. CO₂
18 emission factors for these strength ratios were obtained from Nisbet, Marceau, and VanGeem (2002)
19 and the Slag Cement Association (2013).⁸

20 Emissions from operation of the batch plants were included in the electricity analysis (refer to
21 Section 22A.1.2.10).

22 **22A.2.8 Demolition**

23 Fugitive dust emissions factors for demolition were obtained from the CalEEMod User's Guide
24 appendix (Trinity Consultants 2017). GIS was used to identify the number of demolished structures.
25 The majority of demolished structures are residential and storage/supporting facilities. An average
26 size of 3,000 square feet per structure was therefore conservatively assumed to estimate the total
27 demolished square footage for calculation purposes.

⁶ Metal emissions were also quantified to support the health risk assessment (see Appendix 22C, *Health Risk Assessment*) using emission factors from the EPA's (2006b) AP-42.

⁷ A portion of concrete for the tunnel segments will be provided by three existing batch plants. These facilities are regulated and permitted to emit a maximum amount of criteria pollutants, including particulate matter. Therefore, fugitive dust emissions associated with concrete batching at existing facilities are not included in the analysis as these emissions have already been evaluated and accounted for in existing permit and environmental documents.

⁸ Up to 57% of the CO₂ emitted during the cement manufacturing calcination may be re-absorbed by concrete over the 100 year life cycle (equivalent to about 7% of total batching emissions) (Haselbach 2009). While reabsorption may occur throughout the project lifetime, GHG impacts from concrete batching were conservatively evaluated assuming no reabsorption would occur.

1 22A.2.9 Paving

2 Fugitive ROG emissions associated with paving were calculated using activity data (e.g., square feet
3 paved) provided by the project engineer and the CalEEMod default emission factor of 2.62 pounds of
4 ROG per acre paved (Gillespie pers. comm.; Trinity Consultants 2017).

5 22A.2.10 Electricity Consumption

6 Construction of the water conveyance facility will require the use of electricity for lighting, tunnel
7 ventilation, boring, and certain types of equipment. Operation of the batch plants would also
8 consume electricity. Criteria pollutant and GHG emissions⁹ from generation and transmission of
9 electricity were quantified using emission factors from the CA-GREET model and electricity
10 consumption data provided by the project engineers (Gillespie pers. comm.; Valles pers. comm.).

11 22A.3 Emissions by Air District and Air Basin

12 The project cross three air basins—SFBAAB, SVAB, and SJVAB—and falls under the jurisdiction of
13 four air districts—YSAQMD, SMAQMD, BAAQMD, and SJVAPCD. GIS was used to identify the location
14 of all construction activities. Emissions generated by construction of components that would occur
15 exclusively within one air district were wholly assigned to that air district (e.g., intake construction
16 in SMAQMD). Emissions estimates for components that span more than one air district were
17 apportioned based on the location of construction activity. For example, 11 miles of tunnel will be
18 constructed within Reach 4, of which 7 miles (64%) will be located within the SMAQMD and 4 miles
19 (36%) will be located within the SJVAPCD. Sixty-four percent of Tunnel Reach 4 emissions were
20 therefore appropriated to SMAQMD and the remaining 36% were apportioned to SJVAPCD. Table
21 22B-13 in Appendix 22B, *Air Quality Assumptions* summarizes the air district scaling factors.

22 22A.4 Environmental Commitments

23 DWR has identified several environmental commitments to reduce construction-related criteria
24 pollutants and GHG emissions, as described in Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments*. Because
25 environmental commitments are included as part of the project design, they are not treated as
26 mitigation measures because they are incorporated into the project construction emissions
27 estimate. Accordingly, the following emissions benefits achieved by implementation of the
28 environmental commitments were assumed in the modeling:

- 29 1. **Off-Road Equipment:** All off-road diesel equipment would utilize EPA certified Tier 4 or newer
30 engines. Tier 4 emission factors were obtained from the CalEEMod User's Guide appendix
31 (Trinity Consultants 2017).
- 32 2. **On-Road Haul Trucks:** All heavy-duty haul trucks (T6 and T7) would use model year 2010 or
33 newer engines. The analysis uses emission factors based on model year 2010 or newer engines,

⁹ CA-GREET does not include emission factors for SF₆. Statewide SF₆ emissions in 2015 were therefore used to identify an emission factor per megawatt-hour by dividing total SF₆ emissions by the total electricity generation in California (California Air Resources Board 2017; California Energy Commission 2016).

- 1 and no less than the average fleet mix for the current calendar year as set forth in CARB's
2 EMFAC2017 model.
- 3 3. **Marine Vessels:** All marine vessels would utilize EPA certified Tier 3 or newer engines. Tier 3
4 emission factors were obtained from CARB's (2012) Harbor Craft Methodology.
- 5 4. **Locomotives:** All tunneling locomotives would utilize EPA certified Tier 4 or newer engines.
6 Tier 4 emission factors were obtained from CARB (2010).
- 7 5. **Earth Movement and Road Dust:** Implementation of basic and enhanced fugitive dust control
8 measures would reduce emissions from onsite soil disturbance and re-entrained unpaved road
9 dust were reduced by 61% and 55%, respectively, pursuant to the Western Governors'
10 Association Fugitive Dust Handbook (Countess Environmental 2006).
- 11 6. **Concrete Batching:** All onsite concrete batch plants would implement typical control measures
12 to reduce fugitive dust such as water sprays, enclosures, hoods, and other suitable technology, to
13 reduce emissions to be equivalent to the EPA's controlled emissions levels, as outlined in AP-42
14 (2006b and 2006c) and SMAQMD's (2011) *Concrete Batching Operations Policy Manual*.
- 15 The emission modeling also accounts for implementation of Assembly Bill 1493 (Pavley) and the
16 renewables portfolio standard (RPS). Emissions benefits achieved by these statewide regulations
17 are incorporated into the outputs from EMFAC and CA-GREET, respectively.

18 22A.5 Impact Determination Comparison

19 The Final EIR/EIS (Chapter 22, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases*, Section 22.3.4 Effects and
20 Mitigation—Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A) evaluates 27 project-level air quality and GHG effects
21 based on the analysis conducted at the time. The scope of the air quality analysis has been expanded
22 based on new state and local guidance, as well as to reflect the current state-of-practice (e.g.,
23 SJVAPCD's AAQA trigger and requirement for localized dispersion modeling). The impact statements
24 analyzed in this Supplemental EIR/EIS therefore differ slightly from those in Final EIR/EIS. The
25 revised impact statements are required to fully address the additional air quality analyses.
26 Modifications to the impact statements have also been made to consolidate analyses and improve
27 readability and presentation. Table 22B-14 in Appendix 22B, *Air Quality Assumptions* compares the
28 Supplemental EIR/EIS impact statements to those in the Final EIR/EIS.

29 22A.6 References Cited

30 22A.6.1 Printed References

- 31 California Air Resources Board. 2010. Exhaust and Crankcase Emission Factors for Nonroad Engine
32 Modeling Compression-Ignition. EPA-420-R-10-018. July.
- 33 ———. 2012. Emissions Estimation Methodology for Commercial Harbor Craft Operating in
34 California. February.
- 35 ———. 2017. California's Greenhouse Gas Inventory by Scoping Plan Category (Tenth Edition: 2000
36 to 2015).

- 1 California Energy Commission. 2016. Total Electricity System Power. Available:
2 <http://www.energy.ca.gov/almanac/electricity_data/system_power/2015_total_system_
3 <[power.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/almanac/electricity_data/system_power/2015_total_system_)>. Accessed: February 6, 2018.
- 4 Climate Registry. 2017. 2017 Default Emission Factors. March.
- 5 Countless Environmental. 2006. *WRAP Fugitive Dust Handbook*. September.
- 6 Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). 2012. Helicopter Flying Handbook. FAA-H-8083-21A.
7 Figure 2-32.
- 8 Haselbach, L. 2009. Potential for Carbon Dioxide Absorption in Concrete. *Environmental Engineering*
9 135, 465 (2009).
- 10 MD Helicopters. 2014. MD500E Performance Specifications. Available:
11 <http://www.mdhelicopters.com/helicopters/pdf/500E/performance_specifications.pdf>.
12 Accessed: October 30, 2014.
- 13 Nisbet, M., Marceau, M., and VanGeem, M. 2002. *Environmental Life Cycle Inventory of Portland*
14 *Cement Concrete*. Table 3-13B. PCA R&D Serial No. 2137a. July.
- 15 Port of Long Beach. 2017. *Air Emissions Inventory – 2016*. July
- 16 Slag Cement Association. 2013. Slag Cement in Concrete. *Slag Cement and the Environment*, No. 22.
- 17 Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. 2011. *Concrete Batching Policy Manual*.
18 March.
- 19 Trinity Consultants. 2017. Appendix A Calculation Details for CalEEMod. October
- 20 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1985. AP-42 Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors,
21 4th Ed. Volume II: Mobile Sources. September. Table II-1-7. Available:
22 <<http://www.epa.gov/nscep/index.html>>. Accessed: October 31, 2014.
- 23 ———. 2006a. Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors. Section 13.2.2, Unpaved Roads.
24 Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/index.html>>. Accessed: February 6, 2018.
- 25 ———. 2006b. Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors. Section 11.12, Concrete Batching.
26 Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/index.html>>. Accessed: February 6, 2018.
- 27 ———. 2006c. Section 13.2.4, Aggregate Handling And Storage Piles. Available:
28 <<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/index.html>>. Accessed: February 6, 2018.
- 29 ———. 2011. Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors. Section 13.2.1, Paved Roads. Available:
30 <<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch13/bgdocs/b13s0201.pdf>>. Accessed: February 6,
31 2018.
- 32 ———. 2017. *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2015*. Executive Summary.
33 EPA 430-P-17-001. April.

1 **22A.6.2 Personal Communications**

2 Gillespie, Mike. 5RMK. January-February 2018—email messages to ICF regarding WaterFix
3 construction assumptions.

4 Valles, Sergio. MWD. January-February 2018—email messages to ICF regarding WaterFix
5 construction assumptions.