

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON SAFEWAY FUEL CENTER PUBLIC DRAFT IS/MND

This document provides a response to comments received on the Public Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) that was prepared for the Safeway Fuel Center Project. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 (as amended) (California Public Resources Code 21000 et. seq.), the Public Draft IS/MND was circulated for a 30-day public review and comment period from April 5, 2018 to May 4, 2018.

Notice of availability, notice of intent to adopt and notice of public hearing for the IS/MND was posted with the Sonoma County Clerk, mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the project site, published in the *Argus Courier*, posted to the City's website and submitted to the State Clearinghouse for distribution to State Agencies.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

A number of written comment letters were received during the public review and comment period for the IS/MND. Comments were also received orally from the general public and the Planning Commissioners at the May 8, 2018 Planning Commission public hearing. The individuals providing comments included neighbors, community members, school personnel and parents of students.

Agencies, organizations and individuals that submitted written or oral comments on the IS/MND are listed below;

Agencies

1. California State Clearinghouse
2. California Department of Toxic Substances Control
3. California Department of Transportation

Local Entities & Individuals

1. Petaluma City Schools (Chris Thomas, Chief Business Official)
 - a. Environmental Science Associates (ESA) Memo (Heidi Rous and Tina Su)
2. McDowell Elementary School (Lauri C. Anderson, Principal)
3. Nancy Manchester
4. Kathleen Coon
5. Melodie Kee
6. Michael and Leone Gannon
7. Chris Thomas
8. Jean Bisel
9. Talia Page
10. Laura Gavre
11. Erin Chmielewski
12. Maureen Maguire
13. Robin Aquino
14. Jennifer Benedetti
15. Corinne Reif
16. Laura Steinfels
17. Jennifer Stock
18. Linda Hartrich

19. Rebecca Hachmyer
20. Stacey Earl
21. Christy Giambastiani
22. Betsy Boyle
23. Public Speakers from Planning Commission Hearing (May 8, 2018):
 - a. Lauri Anderson
 - b. Chris Thomas
 - c. Genie Praetzel
 - d. Matthew Pederson
 - e. Dale Wannan
 - f. Elizabeth Ambrosi
 - g. Carol Waxman
 - h. Frances Frazier
 - i. Adriann Saslow
 - j. Horst Steinfels
 - k. Oliver Steinfels
 - l. Rebecca Hachmeyer
 - m. Alexander Saslow
 - n. Maureen Rudder
 - o. Tim Harvey
 - p. Ginee Harvey
 - q. Anna Simson
 - r. Maribel Baron
 - s. Makenna Pearson
24. McDowell Adult Students, Parents, and Community Members (petition dated 2/27/14, 403 signatories, submitted 5/8/18)
25. Parents of children who attend educational programs at McDowell School (petition dated 5/7/18, 116 signatories)

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The responses to public comments have been prepared in consultation with Illingworth & Rodkin, CHS Consulting Group, and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Information in this Responses to Comments document is based on the references to the IS/MND and the following documents:

- Technical Memorandum, Petaluma Safeway Fuel Center: Pedestrian Counts and Safety Analysis, prepared by CHS Consulting Group, June 6, 2018.
- Memo, Safeway Fuel Center Health Risk Assessment, Response to Comment Made by ESA, prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, May 8, 2018.
- Memo, Safeway Fuel Center Health Risk Assessment, Response to Follow-Up Questions, prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, June 6, 2018.
- BAAQMD Permit Application for Safeway Fuel Center, submitted by Safeway, Inc., July 15, 2013.
- BAAQMD, Evaluation Report, Application #405215, Safeway Fuel Center #3011, Facility ID #200026, S. McDowell Blvd. & Maria Drive, Petaluma CA 94954, 2013.
- BAAQMD, Public Notice for Permit Application #405215, Gasoline Dispensing Facility, Safeway Fuel Center #3011, S. McDowell Blvd. & Maria Drive, Petaluma CA 94954, dated August 22, 2013.

- BAAQMD, Authority to Construct for Permit Application #405215, Facility ID #200026, Safeway Fuel Center #3011, S. McDowell Blvd. & Maria Drive, Petaluma CA 94954, dated October 10, 2013.
- BAAQMD, Authority to Construct Extension Application, submitted by Safeway, Inc., October 6, 2017.
- BAAQMD, Authority to Construct for Permit Application #405215, (AC Extension), Facility ID #200026, Safeway Fuel Center #3011, S. McDowell Blvd. & Maria Drive, Petaluma CA 94954, dated November 9, 2017.

California State Clearinghouse

The letter from this agency acknowledges that the City of Petaluma complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for review of draft environmental documents. The State Clearinghouse also forwarded a copy of the comment letter from the California Department of Transportation. No response is necessary.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

The letter from DTSC requests that a copy of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) be provided to the DTSC. The Phase I ESA was subsequently provided to the DTSC. A follow up letter states that the DTSC received the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the project and that the DTSC has no further comments at this time. No further response is necessary.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

The letter from Caltrans requests that copies of the Traffic Study prepared by TJKM Transportation Consultants and the Technical Memorandum prepared by CHS Consulting Group be submitted to Caltrans for review. These two documents were provided to Caltrans upon request, and no further response from Caltrans has been received to date.

The letter also states that the project should be conditioned to contribute fair share traffic impact fees toward future improvements for the U.S. 101/East Washington Street interchange. As stated in the IS/MND, and confirmed by CHS Consulting Group in their Technical Memorandum dated March 16, 2018, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to the transportation network, and no mitigation is required.

Improvements at the East Washington Street/U.S. 101 interchange (northbound and southbound on- and off-ramps) have already been completed. The signal timing changes at the East Washington Street/U.S. 101 interchange (northbound and southbound ramps) and the East Washington Street/North McDowell Boulevard intersection, have also been completed.

As stated on page 55 of the IS/MND, as a standard condition of approval, the applicant shall pay all development impact fees. These fees will contribute to improvements to City roadways and assure that the project's fair share of increased traffic and use of the circulation system has been accounted for. As described in the IS/MND, the payment of impact fees in addition to proposed site design measures will ensure the project's impact to traffic and circulation will be less than significant, and no other improvements or fees specific to Caltrans' facilities are required.

Master Response to Comments on Health Risk Exposure

This master response has been prepared to address issues that were raised by multiple commenters regarding the health risks associated with the proposed Safeway Fuel Center. A number of

commenters expressed concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed Safeway Fuel Center to the surrounding neighborhood and the public facilities located at the McDowell Elementary School Campus, including the Elementary School (421 S. McDowell, Petaluma, Ca 94954), the North Bay Children's Center (405 S. McDowell, Petaluma, CA 94954), Petaluma Adult School (classes held at McDowell Elementary). The commenters assert that operation of the proposed project would cause a significant environmental impact to residents and students, staff, and parents of the McDowell Elementary School and North Bay Children's Center.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District

As stated in Section 3.3 Air Quality of the IS/MND, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is charged with managing air quality for the region, including the City of Petaluma. The BAAQMD has established air quality thresholds of significance for carbon monoxide (CO), ozone precursors (ROG and NOx) and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) from construction and operation of proposed projects. These thresholds are identified in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines established in May 2010, and most recently updated in May 2017. As concluded on pages 18-19 of the IS/MND, and as shown on Tables 3 and 4 therein, none of the pollutant concentrations generated during construction or operation of the proposed project would result in emissions that exceed air quality thresholds established by the BAAQMD.

The BAAQMD also regulates stationary sources of air pollution such as factories, industrial sites, and gasoline stations. In addition to the Guidelines, BAAQMD has established rules in order to ensure that stationary source emitters conform to air quality regulations. The Safeway Fuel Center Project is subject to several of the rules established by BAAQMD including Regulation 8, Rule 7 to control for the emission of reactive organic compound (ROG) from a stationary source emitter due to fuel dispensing onsite, and Regulation 7 which controls for odors. In accordance with BAAQMD regulation (Regulation 2, Rule 2), the proposed project is subject to an Authority to Construct permit for the gasoline dispensing facility, which is a pre-construction permit that is issued before equipment is installed.

Safeway, Inc. submitted a permit application to BAAQMD for the proposed Safeway Fuel Center on July 15, 2013 (Application #405215), including documentation of proposed measures for compliance with the above referenced BAAQMD rules and regulations. In BAAQMD's review of Safeway's application, it was determined that the Best Available Control Technology requirement of BAAQMD's Regulation 2-2-301 was triggered. The triggering of this regulation requires Best Available Control Technology for Gasoline Dispensing Facilities, which considers the use of California Air Resources Board (CARB)-certified Phase-I and Phase-II vapor recovery equipment. BAAQMD concluded that the Safeway Fuel Center would best meet the requirement of this regulation by using CNI enhanced vapor recovery (EVR) Phase I equipment and VST Balance EVR Phase II equipment with the Veeder-Root Vapor Polisher and Veeder-Root ISD controls. These two systems are certified by CARB under Executive Orders VR-104 and VR-204 respectively.

As part of the Authority to Construct application review process, BAAQMD performed a Toxic Risk Screening Analysis, as specified in Regulation 2-5, Table 2-5-1. For a Gasoline Dispensing Facility that meets the best available control technology for toxics requirement, it must also achieve a toxic risk screening level of less than ten in one million. The BAAQMD concluded that the proposed project meets the screening level with a cap on throughput of 25.71 million gallons annually. As such, the BAAQMD determined that the Safeway Fuel Center would be conditioned to 25.71 million gallons per year, which would not exceed Health Risk standards per the BAAQMD's Risk Management Policy.

On August 2013, and in accordance with state law (California Health & Safety Code and District's Regulation 2-1-412), BAAQMD distributed Public Notice to the parents or guardians of students enrolled at McDowell Elementary School and all residences and businesses located within 1,000 feet of the proposed Safeway Fuel Center. The Public Notice stated that a permit application for the Safeway Fuel Center had been filed with BAAQMD. Individuals and businesses were alerted that there was a 30-day period for public response to the proposal. The public comment period on BAAQMD's notice ended on September 23, 2013. During the public comment period, the BAAQMD received the following responses:¹

- Two emails
- Six voice mails
- One letter from a nearby day care center accompanied by 31 signed form letters
- One petition signed by 21 individuals

One commenter was in favor of the new gas station and the balance were opposed to the project. The primary concerns were increased traffic, with its associated impacts on air quality, safety, and parking. Many commenters were also concerned about the increased gasoline vapor emissions and the proposed gas station's proximity to the McDowell Elementary School and North Bay Children's Center (preschool). None of the commenters identified any potential compliance issues with BAAQMD regulations or any deficiency or error in BAAQMD's evaluation of the project. BAAQMD responded to the comments received during the public comment period by email, voicemail, or U.S. mail.

After consideration and responding to the comments received during the public comment period, BAAQMD issued an Authority to Construct permit for the Safeway Fuel Center on October 10, 2013, as a ministerial action under Regulation 2-1-311. BAAQMD conditioned the Safeway Fuel Center to a gasoline throughput not to exceed 25.71 million gallons of fuel per year. Issuance of this permit confirms that BAAQMD reviewed proposed fuel dispensing equipment, considered the source emitter, recommended specific equipment, and determined that the use of that equipment would comply with all air quality rules and regulations.

An extension for the Authority to Construct permit was filed by Safeway, Inc. on October 6, 2017. On November 9, 2017, BAAQMD granted the extension for the Authority to Construct permit; the Authority to Construct permit issued by BAAQMD will expire on November 9, 2019.

Sensitive Receptors

This discussion regarding facilities at the McDowell Elementary School Campus is intended to bolster the description contained in the IS/MND. As stated on page 19 of the IS/MND, the nearest sensitive receptors in proximity to the project site, and their distances from the project's limits of work, include the North Bay Children's Center located at the northeast corner of South McDowell and Maria Drive (60 feet), McDowell Elementary School (475 feet) and associated recreational playfield (60 feet), and residences along South McDowell Boulevard (80 feet).

McDowell Elementary School is located at 421 South McDowell Boulevard. The outdoor recreational school facilities include a ball field; playground with adjacent grass area; and an asphalt blacktop area with basketball courts, tetherball courts, and other outdoor recreational games. The

¹ Duncan Campbell, BAAQMD, Email correspondence, May 25, 2018.

school also contains multiple buildings, an asphalt parking lot, and raised garden beds. In addition to providing education for students in Early Transitional Kindergarten (4 years old) through sixth grade, the school supports the McDowell Family Resource Center, which offers classes through the Petaluma Adult School. Some of the classes offered include English as a Second Language, Computer Applications, Parent Education, and Health Care Education. Additionally, the school provides after-school care on its campus for McDowell and McKinley students from dismissal until 6:00 pm, in partnership with the Boys & Girls Club of Central Sonoma County.

The North Bay Children's Center is located at 405 South McDowell Boulevard. The facility offers a half day preschool for children ages 3 to 5, and is open 8:00 am to 3:00 pm, Monday through Friday. The North Bay Children's Center includes three buildings, an outdoor playground, an asphalt play area, and raised garden boxes.

The McDowell Elementary School Campus is considered a sensitive receptor location since it contains people (children and adults) that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution. Schools, parks, playgrounds, day care centers, preschools and residential homes are all considered sensitive receptor locations. The school facility and nearby residential units were evaluated as sensitive receptors by BAAQMD and by the project level Health Risk Assessment, as disclosed in the IS/MND.

Health Risk Assessment

A number of individuals submitted comments seeking clarification on the Health Risk Assessment (HRA), primarily with regards to the established thresholds for the creation of a Health Risk, methodology used in the HRA, and the health risks for each person (student, teacher, resident) from implementation of the project.

One commenter, Petaluma City Schools, submitted a peer review, performed by ESA, on the HRA that was prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin. ESA's peer review asserts that there were errors and omissions in Illingworth & Rodkin's HRA prepared for the project, and that these errors prevented a proper analysis of the project's impacts on students, staff, and teachers of the schools. ESA's peer review asserts that the HRA is noncompliant with industry standards, makes inaccurate and misleading assumptions, and that the toxic air contaminant (TAC) impact is likely a significant environmental impact.

The following discussion clarifies the thresholds and methodology used in the HRA prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, elaborates on the health risks to sensitive receptors from the proposed project, and addresses specific comments and questions on the HRA raised by the commenters.

BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance for Health Risk Exposure

The HRA prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin relies on the BAAQMD-established thresholds of significance for local community risk and hazard impacts, which apply to the siting of a new stationary source emitter (gasoline station). These thresholds are identified in the BAAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines established in May 2010, and most recently updated in May 2017.

As detailed in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (pages 2-4 and 2-5), local community risk and hazard impacts are associated with TACs and PM_{2.5} because emissions of these pollutants can have significant health impacts at the local level. If emissions of TACs or fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM_{2.5}) exceed any of the

thresholds of significance listed below, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant health risk impact:

- Non-compliance with a qualified risk reduction plan; or
- An excess cancer risk level of more than 10 in one million, or a non-cancer (i.e., chronic or acute) hazard index greater than 1.0 would be a cumulatively considerable contribution; or
- An incremental increase of greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) annual average PM_{2.5} would be a cumulatively considerable contribution.

As described on page 2-5 of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, a project would have a cumulative considerable impact if the aggregate total of all past, present, and foreseeable future sources within a 1,000 foot radius from the fence line of a stationary source emitter plus the contribution from the project, exceeds the following:

- Non-compliance with a qualified risk reduction plan; or
- An excess cancer risk levels of more than 100 in one million or a chronic non-cancer hazard index (from all local sources) greater than 10.0; or
- 0.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ annual average PM_{2.5}.

Health Risk Assessment Methodology

The HRA evaluated the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial air quality pollutants based on an annual fuel throughput of approximately 8.5 million gallons, which is approximately one-third of the throughput conditioned by the BAAQMD. The throughput was based on Safeway's anticipated maximum demand, which is derived from market research and data from other operating Safeway Fuel Centers.

As stated on page 2 of the HRA, emissions of toxic pollutants potentially associated with the project were estimated using various emissions models. Concentrations of these pollutants in the ambient air were estimated using the U.S. EPA ISCST3 dispersion model. The ISCST3 dispersion model is a BAAQMD-recommended model for use in modeling analysis of these types of emission activities for CEQA projects. Health risks were evaluated for a hypothetical maximum exposed individual (MEI) located at the maximum impact of the sensitive receptor. The hypothetical MEI is an individual assumed to be located where the highest concentrations of air pollutants associated with Project emissions are predicted to occur, based on air dispersion modeling. As described in the HRA, increased cancer risks were calculated using the modeled annual concentrations and BAAQMD recommended risk assessment methods for an infant exposure (3rd trimester through 2 years of age), student exposure (9 years) and for adult exposure.

As stated on page 3 of the HRA, the State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and CARB develop recommended methods for conducting health risk assessments. The most recent OEHHA risk assessment guidelines were published in February of 2015. These guidelines incorporate substantial changes designed to provide for enhanced protection of children, as required by State law. CARB has provided additional guidance on implementing OEHHA's recommended methods. The HRA for this project used the 2015 OEHHA risk assessment guidelines and CARB guidance. BAAQMD has adopted recommended procedures for applying the 2015 OEHHA guidelines as part of Regulation 2, Rule 5: New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants. Exposure parameters from the OEHHA guidelines and the recent BAAQMD HRA Guidelines were used in the HRA evaluation.

Breathing Rate Factor

The HRA followed BAAQMD Air Toxics New Source Review (NSR) Program Health Risk Assessment (HRA) Guidelines (December 2016) in evaluating health impacts at sensitive receptors (see page 3 of HRA). The commenter is correct in that BAAQMD HRA guidance (section 2.2) for gasoline dispensing facilities specifies using older 2003 & 2009 OEHHA risk assessment guidance. For student (child) exposure, the only difference between the current BAAQMD guidance and the previous 2003 & 2009 OEHHA guidance is in the value used for a child breathing rate. The current BAAQMD guidance specifies a child breathing rate of 572 L/kg-day while the 2003 OEHHA guidance specifies a breathing rate of 581 L/kg-day.

The HRA focused on identifying the maximum health impacts that would occur from implementation of the project, both during construction and operation. The maximum health impacts were identified for a child located at the North Bay Children's Center, as opposed to an adult working at the school (teacher) or an adult or child residing in the adjacent neighborhood. An adult exposure would occur for a longer duration (30 years instead of 9 years) at a lower age sensitivity factor (ASF = 1 for adult and 3 for a child/student) and at a lower breathing rate (261 L/kg for an adult instead of 572 L/kg for a child). Thus, the teacher cancer risk would be below established thresholds, 70% that of a student and similarly less than significant.

The HRA used a breathing rate of 572 L/kg for a child (see Table 1 on page 5 of HRA). In their memo dated May 8, 2018, Illingworth & Rodkin calculated health risk assuming a breathing rate of 581 L/kg-day for a child. Illingworth & Rodkin determined that the school child cancer risk from benzene emissions from the proposed gasoline dispensing facility would increase by 0.01 in one million when using the 2003 OEHHA breathing rate of 581 L/kg-day compared to the current BAAQMD guidance. That is, the contribution to increased cancer risk would change from 0.39 in one million (BAAQMD Guidelines 2016) to 0.40 in one million (2003 & 2009 OEHHA guidance). The change in cancer risk from this adjustment in the child breathing rate is negligible and impacts remain well below the ten in one million threshold. Thus, applying OEHHA's breathing rate does not change the conclusions of the HRA, nor alter any of the conclusions presented in the IS/MND.

Release Height Factor

Regarding construction-related health risk impacts, there have been various methods applied to address dispersion modeling of construction sites. The HRA (page 8) used a release height of 6 meters (20 feet) to reflect the elevated exhaust stacks of equipment plus the plume rise associated with the exhaust momentum and thermal buoyancy. The use of a 6-meter release height is consistent with release heights used by the CARB when modeling diesel particulate matter (DPM) health risk impacts from construction activities. In describing the methodology used for modeling of DPM emissions from area sources, CARB states "Sensitivity studies have shown that there is an initial plume rise from the equipment due to upward buoyancy and momentum. The release heights of these area sources were determined to be 5 – 10 meters depending on equipment type during operation times." Thus, use of a 6-meter area source release height is considered appropriate and consistent with CARB regulatory modeling.

Regarding release heights for passenger truck and light-duty vehicles, for modeling exhaust and fugitive PM_{2.5} dust emissions from vehicles on nearby roads, the emission release height for heavy-duty vehicles (trucks) was 3.4 meters (11 feet) and the release height for light-duty vehicles was 1.3 meters (4.3 feet), as detailed on page 13 of the HRA. These values are based on release heights recommended by the US Environmental Protection Agency for use in modeling vehicle PM_{2.5} emissions and are representative of the release heights from the mix of different types of trucks and

other vehicles that comprise the general categories of heavy-duty and light-duty vehicles used in construction.

Receptor Height Factor

The HRA used a receptor height of 1.5 meters for the nearby residences and a receptor height of 1.0 meter for children at the daycare and school areas. While the BAAQMD's Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards (May 2012) states that "the default value is assumed to be 0.0 m (i.e., ground-level receptors), the user may enter 1.5 meter to represent the height of an average adult." That is, use of a representative breathing height of a representative individual is appropriate for use in calculating health risks. In this case, as used in the HRA, an average breathing height of 1.5 meters for an adult is acceptable. For a child, use of 1.0-meter breathing height is a reasonable assumption for a child sitting or standing in the school area. It would be unreasonable to assume that the children at the school were at a breathing height of 0.0 meters (i.e., lying down on the floor).

In their memo dated May 8, 2018, Illingworth & Rodkin calculated health risk assuming a 0.0-meter breathing height. Use of a 0.0-meter receptor height instead of a 1.0-meter receptor height would result in benzene concentration being increased by a small amount (i.e., 0.0002 micrograms per cubic meter), such that the computed cancer risk would not change. Therefore, the result of under this scenario (throughput of 25.71 million gallons per year, with a child receptor height of 0.0 meters) as opposed to the previously calculated 1.0-meter receptor height, does not change the conclusions of the HRA, nor alter any of the conclusions presented in the IS/MND.

Throughput Volume

In their memo dated May 8, 2018, Illingworth & Rodkin estimated health risks assuming a throughput of 25.71 million gallons per year, the amount conditioned by the BAAQMD, as opposed to the 8.5 million gallons per year Safeway anticipates using and which was analyzed in the HRA. Under this scenario (throughout of 25.71 million gallons per year), the operational risks at the school would increase by a factor of 3 from 0.69 chances per million to 2.04 chances per million such that the overall excess cancer risk, including project construction (5.8 per one million), would be 7.9 chances per million. This remains below the excess cancer risk of 10 per one million threshold and would similarly have a less than significant impact. This corroborates the conclusion of BAAQMD's Toxic Risk Screening Analysis that was conducted as part of the Authority to Construct Permit review, which determined that operation of a gasoline station with an annual throughput of 25.71 million gallons would not pose a health risk to the community. Even with a throughput of up to 25.71 million gallons per year, the conclusions of the HRA would not change. Therefore, the conclusions related to health risk as presented in the IS/MND, that the proposed gasoline station would not result in health risk impacts, would not be altered.

Methodology Summary

In summary, Illingworth & Rodkin appropriately performed the Health Risk Assessment in accordance with industry standards and acceptable practices and in line with guidance provided by regulatory agencies including BAAQMD, OEEHHA, and CARB. In response to comments received, Illingworth & Rodkin performed additional modeling that incorporated suggested adjustments to the methodology, as suggested by ESA's peer review letter, including: a slightly higher child breathing rate, a child receptor height of 0.0 meters, and a throughput of 25.71 million gallons per year. Even with the adjustments to the methodology as suggested by ESA's peer review comment letter, the resulting health risk level remain below established thresholds and air quality impacts are therefore considered to be less than significant.

Community Health Risk Summary

The discussion below summarizes information contained in the HRA to clarify existing health risks without the project, new health risks introduced by the project, and why the health risks are considered less than significant under CEQA. The thresholds for health risk, at both the individual and cumulative level are described above under “BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance for Health Risk Exposure.”

The HRA evaluated the project’s potential to increase health risks to nearby sensitive receptors from construction and operation of the project. For the short-term exposures associated with construction, a one-year exposure and higher exposure factors (i.e., age sensitivity factors and breathing rate for infants or children) were used for the health risk calculation.

Table 2 in the HRA (page 9) identifies the exposure risks associated with construction activities for the maximally exposed individual (MEI), which consists of a child at the North Bay Children’s Center (preschool) and an infant and adult inhabiting a residence along South McDowell Boulevard south of Maria Drive. All other nearby sensitive receptors would be exposed to health risks below those presented in Table 2, and are therefore not discussed in the HRA. Results in the HRA predicted excess cancer risks, annual PM_{2.5} concentrations, and the Hazard Index to be below the BAAQMD significance thresholds for each sensitive receptor. Therefore, as presented in the IS/MND, the project would have a less than significant impact with respect to community health risks caused by construction activities of the Safeway Fuel Center project.

Operational community risk impacts identified in the HRA were based on traffic generated by the proposed project (traffic traveling to/from project site, traffic idling at project site, truck traffic accessing the site for importing fuel) and evaporative emissions from gasoline (vehicle fueling, transfer and storage of gasoline). Using the maximum modeled diesel particulate matter (DPM), total organic gases (TOG), and benzene concentrations, individual cancer risks were computed using the most recent methods recommended by BAAQMD and OEHHA that include nearly continuous exposures with adjustments for infants and children. Cancer risks were calculated for a 30-year exposure assuming constant emissions at 2019 levels over the entire 30-year period for residences and a 9-year period for school children (see page 13 of HRA). The risks were identified as a worst-case exposure for each person (be it a resident, infant or adult, or a child attending school). The community risk impacts are not additive (e.g., a child who attends North Bay Children’s Center and lives at a residence along South McDowell Boulevard south of Maria Drive would either be exposed as a resident or a child attending school, not both). This is because each receptor is modeled under constant exposure for 30-years in the case of an adult, and 9-years in the case of the child.

Table 3 in the HRA (page 14) displays the operational health risk impacts. Table 3 also identifies the combined health risks from construction activity and operation of the proposed project. (Additional details regarding the assumptions used in the HRA for the combined health risks from construction and operation, are presented in Illingworth & Rodkin’s Memo dated June 6, 2018 in Appendix B.) Table 3 of the HRA summarizes impacts from the proposed project (considered a single-source emitter²) at the individual level: Residential (a person inhabiting a residence on South McDowell Boulevard) and School Child (a child attending the North Bay Children’s Center). The excess cancer risk, maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentration, and Hazard Index were compared with

² Single source emitters are individually permitted facilities, such as the proposed Safeway Fuel Center.

BAAQMD's thresholds related to single sources. The results in the HRA (Table 3) predicted excess cancer risks, annual PM2.5 concentrations, and the Hazard Index to be below the BAAQMD significance thresholds for each sensitive receptor. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact with respect to community risk caused by construction and operation of the proposed project.

Additionally, the HRA (Table 3) identifies other sources of TACs or PM2.5 within 1,000 feet of the project site (cumulative sources³): traffic on South McDowell and traffic on U.S. 101. (Note: The health risks associated with these sources demonstrate the existing risks (without the project) to children at the school and people inhabiting the residences along South McDowell Boulevard.) Table 3 also demonstrate the effects of cumulative sources on the identified sensitive receptors (Residential and School Child) combined with traffic along S. McDowell Boulevard and traffic along US 101. The excess cancer risk, maximum annual PM2.5 concentration, and Hazard Index were compared with BAAQMD's thresholds related to cumulative sources. The results in the HRA (Table 3) predicted cumulative excess cancer risks, annual PM2.5 concentrations, and the Hazard Index to be below the BAAQMD significance thresholds for each sensitive receptor. Therefore, as concluded in the IS/MND, the project would have a less than significant impact with respect to community risk caused by construction and operation of the proposed project, when combined with other sources of TACs and PM2.5 within 1,000 feet of the project site.

Conclusion

As explained herein, based on the record, the City finds that all potentially significant impacts related to health risk have been adequately addressed in the IS/MND and this Response to Comments. As such, none of the conclusions of the air quality discussion in the Draft IS/MND have changed, and no further analysis is necessary.

Master Response to Comments on Traffic

This master response has been prepared to address issues that were raised by commenters regarding trip generation and pedestrian safety associated with the proposed Safeway Fuel Center project.

This response relies on information contained in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by TJKM Transportation Consultants for the Safeway Fuel Center in August 13, 2014 and the Technical Memorandum (TM) updating the Safeway Fuel Center TIS, prepared by CHS Consulting Group in March 16, 2018; both of these documents were included and referenced in the Public Draft IS/MND. Additionally, the following is informed by a memo from CHS, dated June 6, 2018, responding to comments raised during the public review period relating to pedestrian facilities and safety.

Safeway Fuel Center Trip Generation Methodology

The 2014 TIS and the 2018 Technical Memorandum use the same methodology to estimate trip generation. The 2014 TIS estimated the Project's trip generation based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip rates published in Trip Generation, 9th Edition and empirical data from field surveys of two existing Bay Area Safeway gas stations in Pleasant Hill and Campbell. The Pleasant Hill and Campbell gas stations are similar to the proposed project in terms of size, hours of operation, circulation layout, adjacent grocery store size, and local setting (in a shopping plaza).⁴

³ Cumulative source emitters consists of the combination of individually permitted facilities within 1,000 feet along with other area source emissions such as vehicles exhaust from roadways.

⁴ Page 12 of the 2014 Traffic Study prepared by TJKM , August 13, 2014.

The 2018 Traffic Memo (page 3) clarifies that the 2014 TIS did not apply industry standard trip reductions for commercial uses on or formerly occupying the Project site, nor did the 2014 TIS apply reductions for internal, pass by, or diverted trips. Definitions of internal, pass-by, and diverted trips are provided in the 2018 Memo in an effort to demonstrate that the analysis is conservative and precludes industry standard trip reductions for gas station projects. The Traffic Memo explains that internal, pass by, and diverted trips could result in the following reduction (but were not applied):

- 39 percent of the trips to the Fuel Center will be internal trips
- 25 percent of the trips to the Fuel Center will be pass-by trips
- 25 percent of the trips to the Fuel Center will be diverted trips
- 11 percent of the trips to the Fuel Center will be “new” trips

The 2014 TIS and the 2018 Traffic Memo do not take any reductions for internal, pass by, and/or diverted trips. The trip generation of the proposed Safeway Fuel Center project consists of 210 weekday a.m. peak hour trips, 276 p.m. peak hour trips, and 336 Saturday afternoon peak hour trips, all of which are considered and analyzed in the level of service analysis of the 2018 TM. While the internal, pass-by, and diverted vehicle trips were identified in the 2018 TM, these deductions were not taken in the 2018 analysis.

Pedestrian Access

Commenters expressed concern regarding pedestrian safety at the intersection of South McDowell and Maria Drive. Presently, this intersection is signalized, contains sidewalk on both sides and contains pedestrian improvements including striping for pedestrian crosswalk, pedestrian signals and curb ramps. The crosswalk distance is approximately 50 feet when crossing Maria Drive and 80 feet when crossing S. McDowell Boulevard.

To understand the existing collision and accident frequency at this intersection, CHS reviewed collision data from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) between 2012 to 2016 for the intersection of South McDowell Boulevard and Maria Drive. Results of collision data are detailed in CHS’s memo dated June 6, 2018.

CHS concluded that pedestrian counts at the Maria Drive/McDowell Boulevard intersection indicate a low level of pedestrian activity during the a.m., midday, and p.m. peak periods, which is reflective of a free flow level of service with no impedances to pedestrian movements during all peak periods. The five-year collision history at the Maria Drive/McDowell Boulevard intersection indicates a low rate of collisions over the last five-year reporting period with four vehicle collisions per year on average. CHS concluded that there were no patterns of pedestrian involved collisions that would suggest a safety concern at the Maria Drive/McDowell Boulevard intersection.

The City’s Safe Routes to School Plan provides recommendations for pedestrian safety at the McDowell Boulevard/Maria Drive intersection. The suggestions include minor sidewalk repairs, widening the sidewalks, and including a pedestrian phase at the signal. Consistent with these recommendations, as a condition of approval, the proposed project would be required to achieve the following: 1) replace the existing sidewalks, driveways, and curb ramps that are broken or cracked along the project site frontage to Maria Drive and South McDowell Boulevard; 2) install a new, accessible, and directional pedestrian ramp at the McDowell/Maria intersection; and 3) install a pedestrian crossing warning sign at the proposed driveway entrances.

With the conditions of approval, pedestrian facilities at the intersection of Maria Drive/McDowell Boulevard will be improved. There are no significant impacts identified related to pedestrian access, safety concerns or lack of connectivity. Therefore, the MND concluded that impacts of the proposed project to transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS SUMMARY

The City of Petaluma carefully reviewed the information developed through the response to comments process and determined that the project does not meet any of the conditions under CEQA Section 15073.5. Therefore, the recirculation of a revised IS/MND or the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is not required. Consistent with the CEQA Guidelines, this Response to Comments document clarifies the information and analyses in the IS/MND.

The City of Petaluma will consider the Public Draft IS/MND, together with this Response to Comments document, prior to making a decision on the IS/MND and the proposed project.

REFERENCES

The following materials are incorporated by reference and included as attachments to the June 26, 2018 Planning Commission staff report.

- Comment Letters
- Illingworth & Rodkin Response to Comments, May 8, 2018
- Illingworth & Rodkin Response to Follow Up Comments, June 6, 2018
- CHS Technical Memo, June 6, 2018