Appendix B3
Health Risk Assessment

Contents

1.0 Introduction B3-1
2.0 Emission Estimation Approach B3-3
2.1 Emissions Used for Cancer Risk B3-4
2.2 Emissions Used for Non-Cancer Hazard Indices B3-5
2.3 TAC Speciation B3-6
3.0 Air Dispersion Modeling B3-9
3.1 Model Selection B3-9
3.2 Receptors B3-9
4.0 Health Risk Assessment Approach B3-21
4.1 Toxicity Assessment B3-21
4.2 Exposure Assessment B3-25
4.3 Risk Characterization B3-26
4.3.1 Estimation of Individual Cancer Risk B3-26
4.3.2 Population Cancer Burden B3-29
4.3.3 Non-Cancer Chronic and Acute HI B3-29
5.0 Significance Criteria B3-30
6.0 Predicted Incremental Health Impacts B3-31
6.1 Individual Cancer Risk B3-37
6.2 Population Cancer Burden B3-38
6.3 Chronic and Acute Hazard Indices B3-38
7.0 Source Contributions B3-38
8.0 Risk Uncertainty B3-39
9.0 References B3-42

List of Tables

Table B3-1. Speciation Profiles for PM_{10} and TOG B3-7
Table B3-2. Non-Residential Sensitive Receptor Descriptions[a] B3-13
Table B3-3. Toxicity Values Used In the HRA B3-23
Table B3-4. Cancer Risk Exposure Assumptions by Receptor Type B3-27
Table B3-5. Maximum Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and Operation of the Proposed Project B3-32
Table B3-6. Source Contributions to Cancer Risk at the Non-Residential Sensitive, Residential, and Occupational Receptor with Maximum Exposure for the Proposed Project Relative to the Floating Future Baseline B3-39

List of Figures

Figure B3-1. HRA Modeled Receptor Locations (Far Field) B3-10
Figure B3-2. HRA Modeled Receptor Locations (Near Field) B3-11
Figure B3-3. HRA Modeled Non-Residential Sensitive Receptors Near Berths 148-151 ..... B3-12
Figure B3-4. Isopleths of 30-Year Incremental Residential Cancer Risks – Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline B3-33
Figure B3-5. Isopleths of 30-Year Incremental Residential Cancer Risks – Proposed Project Minus Future Floating Baseline B3-34
Figure B3-6. Isopleths of 25-year Incremental Occupational Cancer Risks – Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline B3-35
Figure B3-7. Isopleths of 25-year Incremental Occupational Cancer Risks – Proposed Project Minus Future Floating Baseline B3-36

1.0 Introduction

This appendix describes the methods and results of a health risk assessment (HRA) that evaluates potential public health effects from toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions that would be generated during construction and operation of the Berths 148-151 (Phillips 66) Marine Oil Terminal and Wharf Improvements Project (the Proposed Project) at the Port of Los Angeles as described in Chater 2 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). TACs are compounds known or suspected to cause adverse health effects after short-term (acute) or long-term (cancer and chronic non-cancer) exposure. Information about emission sources and their estimation methods are summarized in Appendix B1 (Air Quality Regulations/Methodology and Air Quality and GHG Emissions/Energy) and information about dispersion modeling methodology and results is included in Appendix B2 (Air Dispersion Modeling).

The following scenarios were analyzed:

- **Proposed Project:** this scenario represents activities associated with the construction and operations for the improvements of Berths 148-151, including topside and landside improvements of the marine oil terminal, as well as future operational activities.
- Health risk values associated with the scenarios described above and evaluated under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) were analyzed relative to the following two baseline scenarios:
- **2021 Baseline:** Sometimes referred to as the "CEQA baseline", this baseline scenario represents recorded actual activity and throughput of terminal operations in the baseline year (2021). Emission factors reflect age of the equipment, vessel and truck fleet as well as local, federal and state regulations in place in 2021.
- **Floating Future Baseline**: This baseline scenario assumes 2027 activity levels throughout the future years (2027 through 2057). However, effects of future regulations on the various emission sources and normal turn-over of equipment are taken into account. That is, mass emissions of individual future years would typically decrease over time due to regulatory effects.

To determine whether the Proposed Project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on the environment, impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project are compared to a baseline condition. The difference between the Proposed Project versus the baseline is then compared to a threshold to determine if the difference between the two is significant.

This HRA was prepared in accordance with the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)'s *Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments* (OEHHA 2015) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) *Supplemental Guidelines for Preparing Risk Assessments for the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act* (SCAQMD 2025). The HRA includes an evaluation of four different types of health effects: individual excess lifetime cancer risk,[1]

[1]An estimated increased excess lifetime cancer risk is not a specific estimate of expected cancers. Rather, it is a plausible upper bound estimate of the probability that a person may develop cancer sometime in his or her lifetime following exposure to that contaminant.

population cancer burden, chronic non-cancer hazard index (HI), and acute non-cancer HI.

- Individual excess lifetime cancer risk (referred to hereafter simply as "individual cancer risk") is the additional chance for a person to contract cancer after long-term exposure to Project emissions (30 years for a resident[2] and 25 years for an off-site worker). An estimated cancer risk below 10 in 1 million indicates that significant carcinogenic health effects are not expected.
- Population cancer burden is the expected number of additional cancer cases in the population in areas where the maximum cancer risk for residential receptors is greater than or equal to 1 in a million (the "impact zone") from the Proposed Project or the alternative scenarios based on 70-year residential cancer risk estimates. An estimated cancer burden below 0.5 excess cancer cases indicates that the significant population cancer burden is not expected.
- The chronic HI evaluates the potential for long-term non-cancer adverse health impacts determined by dividing the annual average airborne concentration at the receptor by the chronic reference exposure level (REL, defined as the concentration at which no adverse noncancer health effects are anticipated even in sensitive members of the general population under specified exposure scenarios) for a TAC. A chronic HI below 1.0 indicates that significant adverse non-cancer health effects from long-term exposure are not expected.
- The acute HI is a ratio of maximum 1-hour average concentrations of TACs in the air to established acute RELs. An acute HI below 1.0 indicates that significant adverse non-cancer health effects from short-term exposure are not expected.

The OEHHA HRA guidelines also provide a methodology for determining an 8-hour chronic HI, which evaluates repeated 8-hour exposures over a significant fraction of a lifetime when the Project emits only a portion of the day (OEHHA 2015). This health risk evaluation is applicable primarily to off-site workers with work schedules that align with the emitting facility's operational schedule. Because the facility is anticipated to operate 24 hours per day, the average 8-hour concentrations to which off-site workers would be exposed would be less than the annual concentrations used to calculate the chronic HI. Moreover, the toxicity factors for the 8-hour chronic HI are less stringent and apply to fewer TACs than the toxicity factors for the chronic HI. As a result, the 8-hour chronic hazard indices associated with the Proposed Project and alternatives would be less than the chronic HIs. Therefore, this HRA does not quantify 8-hour chronic HI, and instead uses the chronic HI as a conservative health value for off-site workers.

As described in Appendix B2 (Air Dispersion Modeling), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) dispersion model AERMOD, version 22112 (USEPA 2022), was used to develop dispersion factors for each source of emissions and to predict annual average and hourly maximum ambient pollutant concentrations outside the Project site. The HRA was conducted in accordance with guidelines from OEHHA (OEHHA 2015) and SCAQMD (SCAQMD 2025) based on output from the AERMOD dispersion model. Project TAC emissions include multi-pathway chemicals as defined by

[2] Other non-residential sensitive receptor types (e.g., schools, child cares, elder cares, hospitals and recreational areas, etc.) are expected to have lower exposures than a resident, and were conservatively evaluated under the continuous 30-year residential exposure scenario in this analysis.

OEHHA (2015)[3]. These multi-pathway chemicals are a small subset of TACs that need to be evaluated by the appropriate non-inhalation pathways, as well as by the inhalation pathway. The Hotspots Analysis and Reporting Program (HARP2) Risk Assessment Standalone Tool (RAST), version 22118 (CARB 2022), was used to perform the health risk calculations for the non-inhalation pathways for the multi-pathway chemicals.

The HRA was developed based on estimation of construction and operational emissions for the 2021 Baseline, Floating Future Baseline, and Proposed Project, and dispersion modelling. Appendix B1 (Air Quality Regulations/Methodology and Air Quality and GHG Emissions/Energy) and Appendix B2 (Air Dispersion Modeling) of this Draft EIR provide detailed methodology for the emissions estimation and dispersion modeling respectively. Incremental health impacts are evaluated by comparing potential health impacts posed by the Proposed Project relative to the 2021 Baseline and Floating Future Baseline scenarios. The following sections provide additional details on the methods used to complete the HRA.

2.0 Emission Estimation Approach

The following on-site construction emission sources were included in the HRA:

- Engine exhaust emissions from off-road diesel construction equipment;
- Engine exhaust emissions from diesel hauling trucks while driving and idling on-site;
- Engine exhaust emissions from gasoline work vehicles driving and idling within the site during construction; and
- Engine exhaust emissions from harbor craft used to support construction of structures in or near the water and clean-up dredging.

In accordance with SCAQMD guidance (SCAQMD 2005), only onsite construction emission sources were evaluated for health risk impacts. Onsite emission sources included diesel engine exhaust from land and marine heavy construction equipment, haul trucks traveling and idling onsite, and harbor craft, such as tugboats, crew boats, and survey boats, used in construction of structures and dredging. Off-site driving emissions for vehicles involved in construction were excluded. In addition, fugitive dust from earth moving activities during construction, wind erosion or road dust are not included in the health risk per SCAQMD guidance.

The following operational emission sources associated with the Proposed Project were included in the HRA:

- Tanker vessel and barge sources generate emissions from 40-nautical miles offshore, which approximately coincides with the Southern California Air Basin (SCAB) overwater boundary, to Berth 150-151. Emissions activity included transit in the 40 to 20 nautical mile area, the 20-nautical-mile to precautionary area, within the precautionary area, the precautionary area to anchorage, and the maneuvering zones as well as hoteling in the anchorage and berthing zones.

[3] In addition to the inhalation pathway, a small subset of TACs is subject to deposition onto soil, plants, and/or water bodies, and therefore need to be evaluated by the appropriate noninhalation pathways. Such substances are referred to as the multipathway chemicals (See section 5.2 and Table 5.1 of the OEHHA Hot Spot Guidance).

- Harbor craft, consisting of tugboats/assist tugs used to assist tanker vessels while maneuvering and docking during operations. Two tugboats were assumed to be required for assistance of each tanker arrival/departure; only one assist tug is required for articulated tug-barges (ATBs), ocean-going barges, and the California Air Resources Board (CARB)-approved Emission Capture and Control System (CAECS) barge used to comply with the CARB At-Berth Regulation as described in Appendix B1(Air Quality Regulations/Methodology and Air Quality and GHG Emissions/Energy).
- Heavy-duty trucks hauling lube oil from the terminal. Among the operation, modes are on-terminal idling; driving on-terminal; and driving off-terminal along the primary truck routes. Truck emission sources include diesel engine exhaust, tire wear, brake wear, and fugitive road dust. The fugitive road dust from operational truck transit off-site does not include TACs; therefore is not evaluated in the health risk analysis.
- Stationary sources at the Phillips 66 Marine Oil Terminal (MOT) include a tank farm containing 26 storage tanks of varying sizes. Other landside facilities on the site include piping systems, pumps and compressors, vapor-recovery equipment used when loading (i.e., exporting) lighter commodities, a dock house, a gatehouse, a truck loading rack, a warehouse, an office building, and electrical substations.
- Since very few (up to eight) workers are used for onsite operations and the number of workers would not increase as part of the Proposed Project, worker gasoline light-duty vehicles were considered *de minimis* sources and were not modeled.

2.1 Emissions Used for Cancer Risk

To estimate cancer risk impacts for the construction and operation of the Proposed Project and alternatives, annual volatile organic compound (VOC) and particulate matter (PM) less than 10 micron (PM_{10}) emissions associated with terminal construction and operation were estimated for each year of several long-term exposure periods and speciated into their TAC components as necessary for the HRA analysis (see Section 2.3). The cancer risk exposure periods were 30 years for residents and other types of non-residential sensitive receptors such as schools, daycares, hospitals, recreational facilities, parks, and elder care facilities, 25 years for occupational receptors, and 70 years for the population cancer burden analysis. The initial year of each Proposed Project scenario's exposure period was assumed to be 2027, which corresponds to the highest emissions year due to overlapping of Project construction and full Project operations emissions (construction emissions in the remaining construction years [2028 – 2029] are no greater than in 2027) and results in the most conservative estimates of health risks. For example, the 30-year residential exposure period for the Proposed Project scenario was assumed to occur during the years 2027 - 2057. (As described in Section 2.5.1, the assumed dates are for analytical purposes only and mean that the analysis is conservative, as a later start date would result in cleaner construction and operational equipment being used.)

Diesel exhaust emissions from Proposed Project construction activities are roughly comparable to those from on-site operational sources in 2027 (see Appendix B1, Air Quality Regulations/Methodology and Air Quality and GHG Emissions/Energy). Because the majority of the mass annual operational emissions from vessel and harbor craft transits occur off-site and farther away from onshore receptor sites, it is more

conservative to include the years when emissions occur nearest to the sensitive receptors, such as those when construction is scheduled to take place. Therefore, setting the starting year of the HRA to 2027 accounts for the health impact from peak emissions while still yielding conservative health risk estimates.

Annual VOC and PM_{10} emissions were estimated using the methodology and assumptions described in Appendix B1(Air Quality Regulations/Methodology and Air Quality and GHG Emissions/Energy). These emissions account for the projected potential future increase in vessel calls and product throughput, and the future reduction in emission factors for selected equipment in response to existing regulations. Annual emissions for analysis years of 2021, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029 and 2057 were modeled to estimate TAC concentrations, and concentrations for the interim years were estimated via linear interpolation using the concentrations of each modeled analysis year. In the case of the 30-year individual residential cancer risk and the 70-year cancer burden calculations, the extent of this analysis assumes exposure beyond the last emissions analysis year (2057) are identical to those calculated for 2057, i.e., emissions after 2057 were assumed to remain constant at their 2057 values.

To better apprise the public and decision makers of the Proposed Project's environmental impacts, the predicted cancer risks for the analytical scenarios were compared to the following two variations of the baseline: the 2021 Baseline and the Floating Future Baseline. The Floating Future Baseline cancer risks are typically lower than the 2021 Baseline cancer risks because emission factors for port-related equipment generally decline over time in response to existing air quality regulations and assumptions regarding equipment fleet turnover. This declining trend in future emission factors is accounted for in the Floating Future Baseline but not the 2021 Baseline. As a result, the Project cancer risk increments relative to the Floating Future Baseline are generally greater than the increments relative to the 2021 Baseline. Increments relative to the Floating Future Baseline and the 2021 Baseline) were used to determine the significance of impacts.

The use of both the 2021 Baseline and Floating Future Baseline for cancer risk helps to resolve the complication of evaluating the terminal during a fixed point in time (2021 baseline conditions) for a health impact that is based on decades-long exposure periods. This complication does not exist for the chronic and acute hazard indices because they are based on modeled TAC concentrations of one year and one hour within the baseline period, respectively, and do not involve changes across time. Therefore, the Floating Future Baseline was used only for cancer risk evaluation under CEQA.

2.2 Emissions Used for Non-Cancer Hazard Indices

To estimate chronic and acute non-cancer hazard indices for Proposed Project, annual and peak hour construction emissions of VOC and PM_{10} were calculated for each year of construction, 2024 - 2029; and for the operational analysis years 2021, 2027, and 2057. Emissions were estimated using the methodology and assumptions described in Appendix B1(Air Quality Regulations/Methodology and Air Quality and GHG Emissions/Energy). Because prior Port projects have shown that the chronic and acute HIs are unlikely to exceed the significance thresholds, a conservative screening approach was used where each AERMOD construction and operational emission source was modeled with its maximum annual and hourly emissions even if the emissions would not occur at the same time for all sources.

2.3 TAC Speciation

Diesel internal combustion (IC) engines represent the biggest source of TAC emissions associated with the Proposed Project in terms of their contribution to cancer and chronic non-cancer health values. Diesel combustion sources include vessel propulsion and auxiliary engines, tugboats, barges, diesel off-road equipment, and diesel heavy-duty trucks. For the determination of cancer risk and chronic hazard indices, annual PM_{10} emissions from diesel engine tailpipe sources were evaluated as a surrogate for diesel exhaust emissions, in accordance with OEHHA's recommendation in the Hot Spots Guidance (2015). The cancer and chronic non-cancer toxicity values for diesel exhaust PM_{10} (diesel particulate matter [DPM]) established by OEHHA and CARB (CARB 2023) are representative of whole diesel IC engine exhaust. Therefore, it was not necessary in this analysis to speciate diesel IC engine exhaust into its chemical components for the determination of cancer risk and chronic non-cancer hazard indices. OEHHA and CARB have not established acute toxicity factors for DPM. Therefore, peak hour VOC and PM_{10} emissions from all sources, including diesel IC engines, were speciated into their individual TAC components for the determination of acute hazard indices.

HRA sources other than diesel IC engines include marine distillate combustion in boilers, petroleum vapor emissions, and truck tire and brake wear. For these sources, VOC and PM_{10} emissions were speciated into their individual TAC components for the determination of cancer risk, chronic hazard indices, and acute hazard indices. The speciation profiles used in the HRA were developed by CARB (2023). Table B3-1 presents the speciation profiles that were used to convert PM_{10} emissions and total organic gas (TOG) emissions into individual TACs for all emission sources. Prior to speciation, VOC emissions were converted to TOG using factors provided by CARB (2023).

Table B3-1. Speciation Profiles for PM_{10} and TOG

		Weight Fraction of PM_{10}								Weight Fraction of TOG[a]		
Toxic Air Contaminant[b]	HARP TAC ID	Profile 9901: Diesel IC Engine Exhaust[c]	Profile 42514 Diesel Vehicles[d]	Profile 119: Marine Vessels Liquid Fuel[d]	Profile 4251: Marine Vessels - MGO (0.1 PCT S)[d]	Profile 116: Diesel IC Engine[d]	Profile 1107: Tanker boiler burning MGO (0.045% sulfur)	Profile 472: Tire Wear[b]	Profile 473: Brake Wear[b]	Profile 316: Petroleum Vapors	Profile 504: Boilers	Profile 818: Diesel IC Engine Exhaust[d]
DPM	9901	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arsenic	7440382	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00001	0	0	0
Bromine	7726956	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.000015	0.00004	0	0	0
Chlorine	7782505	0	0	0	0	0	0.000221	0.0078	0.0015	0	0	0
Chromium III	16065831	0	0.00057665	0	0	0	0.000559	0.000029	0.0011	0	0	0
Chromium VI	18540299	0	0.00003035	0	0	0	0.0000294	0.0000015	0.00006	0	0	0
Copper	7440508	0	0.000356	0	0	0	0.000221	0.00049	0.011	0	0	0
Lead	7439921	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00016	0.00005	0	0	0
Manganese	7439965	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0001	0.0017	0	0	0
Nickel	7440020	0	0	0	0	0	0.000441	0.00005	0.00066	0	0	0
Selenium	7782492	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00002	0.00002	0	0	0
Sulfates	9960	0	0.285538	0.15	0.08	0.15	0.238271	0.0025	0.033	0	0	0
Vanadium	7440622	0	0	0.0055	0	0.0055	0.003162	0	0.00066	0	0	0
1,3-Butadiene	106990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0019
Acetaldehyde	75070	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.074
Benzene	71432	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0010	0.022	0.020
Chlorobenzene	108907	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0005	0
Ethyl Benzene	100414	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0007	0.0031
Formaldehyde	50000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0010	0.15
Hexane	110543	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.034	0.016	0.0016
Methanol	67561	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00030
Methyl Ethyl Ketone	78933	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.015
Naphthalene	91203	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0007	0.0009
Propylene	115071	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0010	0.046	0.026

		Weight Fraction of PM_{10}								Weight Fraction of TOG[a]		
Toxic Air Contaminant[b]	**HARP TAC ID**	**Profile 9901: Diesel IC Engine Exhaust[c]**	**Profile 42514 Diesel Vehicles[d]**	**Profile 119: Marine Vessels Liquid Fuel[d]**	**Profile 4251: Marine Vessels - MGO (0.1 PCT S)[d]**	**Profile 116: Diesel IC Engine[d]**	**Profile 1107: Tanker boiler burning MGO (0.045% sulfur)**	**Profile 472: Tire Wear[b]**	**Profile 473: Brake Wear[b]**	**Profile 316: Petroleum Vapors**	**Profile 504: Boilers**	**Profile 818: Diesel IC Engine Exhaust[d]**
Styrene	100425	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0006
Toluene	108883	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0050	0.022	0.015
Xylenes	1330207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0031	0.0105
Applicable Sources:		All diesel IC engines - harbor craft, marine vessel, truck, offroad equipment (CANCER/ CHRONIC)	On-road trucks, off-road equipment (ACUTE ONLY[e])	Harbor craft, ITB/ATB main engines (ACUTE ONLY[e])	Tanker main and auxiliary engines (ACUTE ONLY[e])	ITB/ATB auxiliary engines (ACUTE ONLY[e])	Tanker boilers (CANCER/ CHRONIC/ ACUTE)	Tire wear (CANCER/ CHRONIC/ ACUTE)	Brake wear (CANCER/ CHRONIC/ ACUTE)	Storage tanks and piping vapors, vessel loading vapors (CANCER/CHRONIC/ACUTE)	Tanker boilers (CANCER/ CHRONIC/ ACUTE)	On-Road trucks, off-road equipment, harbor craft, ITB/ATB main and auxiliary engines, tanker main and auxiliary engines (ACUTE ONLY[e])

Notes:

[a] TOG speciation profiles were converted to VOC by dividing by the following VOC/TOG ratios: 0.8785 for Profile 818, 0.946 for Profile 504, and 0.656 for Profile 316.

[b] Only TACs that have OEHHA/CARB toxicity factors are shown in the table.

[c] Profile 9901 represents diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from diesel internal combustion engines. This profile was used for the determination of cancer risk and the chronic hazard index because the health values for DPM are representative of diesel IC engine exhaust as a whole.

[d] Profiles No. 42514, 119, 4251, and 116 and 818 are associated with diesel IC engines and therefore were only used for the determination of the acute hazard index.

[e] Profiles for the diesel or diesel-like marine vessel MGO sources were used to speciate the one-hour maximum emissions from these sources for the acute HI evaluations only.

Source for speciation profiles except #9901: Speciation Profiles Used in CARB Modeling. Available: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/speciation-profiles-used-carb-modeling. See notes for Profiles #9901.

3.0 Air Dispersion Modeling

3.1 Model Selection

The air dispersion modeling was performed using the USEPA AERMOD dispersion model, version 22112 (USEPA 2022), based on the *Guideline on Air Quality Models* (USEPA 2017). The emission source parameters, meteorological data, model options, and temporal distribution assumptions used in the HRA are the same as described in Appendix B2 (Air Dispersion Modeling). Sources were grouped into source groups in AERMOD based on those with common speciation profiles.

3.2 Receptors

The HRA modeled TAC concentrations and health effects at 4,578 locations (3,051 receptors excluding locations on the facility fenceline, waterbodies, or highways) throughout the modeling domain (Figure B3-1) surrounding the Project area, including the locations of potentially exposed residents, offsite workers, and other non-residential sensitive receptors of the local population. On-site locations were not included in the list of receptors. Health impacts were not presented at receptors located in marinas except that the liveaboards at marinas were conservatively included in the HRA as residential receptors. Sensitive receptor population groups include residents, children, the elderly, and the acutely and chronically ill. The locations of sensitive receptor groups include residences, schools, childcare centers, elder care facilities, and hospitals. For health risk assessment purposes, the Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD) also treats recreational areas, such as parks, marinas, and public waterfront areas, as sensitive receptor locations (LAHD 2017). For the purposes of this HRA, non-residential sensitive receptors were identified and included in the model. For simplification, the non-residential sensitive receptors were conservatively evaluated using the default residential exposure assumptions assuming 30 years' continuous exposure. This assumption is conservative and overestimates cancer risk for non-residential sensitive receptors.

Cartesian coordinate receptor grids were used to provide adequate spatial coverage surrounding the Project area to assess ground-level TAC concentrations, identify the extent of impacts, and identify maximum impact locations. AERMOD modeling was conducted with a 50 by 50 meter (m) grid up to 0.5 kilometer (km) from the facility fence line, a 100 by 100 m grid from 0.5 km to 1 km from the facility fence line, a 250 by 250 m grid from 1 km to 5 km from the facility fence line, and a 500 by 500 m grid from 5 km to 10 km from the facility fence line.

In addition to the gridded receptor sets, previously identified non-residential sensitive receptors near the Berths 148-151 facility were also included. These receptors included schools, childcare centers, hospitals, recreational facilities, parks, and elder care facilities. 50 by 50 m grids were placed in potential maximally exposed individual (MEI) locations near sources. Receptors were also located at 50-m spacing along the Berths 148-151 facility fence line.

Figures B3-1 and B3-2 show the full set of receptor points modeled in the HRA. The far field view shows the full extent of receptors modeled, and the near field shows a closer view of the terminal with more densely spaced receptors in areas near residential and non-residential sensitive areas near sources. Figure B3-3 shows only the non-residential

sensitive receptors modeled in the HRA; the figure is paired with Table B3-2, which provides descriptions and addresses of the non-residential sensitive receptors.

Figure B3-1. HRA Modeled Receptor Locations (Far Field)




Figure B3-2. HRA Modeled Receptor Locations (Near Field)




Figure B3-3. HRA Modeled Non-Residential Sensitive Receptors Near Berths 148-151




Table B3-2. Non-Residential Sensitive Receptor Descriptions[a]

No.[b]	Receptor Description	Street Address	City, State, Zip	Category
1	7th Street Elementary School	1570 W. 7th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
2	15th Street Elementary School	1527 Mesa St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
3	Academy of the Two Hearts School	1540 S. Walker Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
4	Angel's Gate High School	3607 S. Gaffey St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
5	Apostolic Faith Center/Apostolic Faith Academy	1530 E Robidoux St	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
6	Artesia Well Preparatory Academy	1235 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
7	Avalon High School	1425 N Avalon Blvd	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
8	Bandini Street Elementary School	425 N. Bandini St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
9	Barton Hill Elementary School	423 N. Pacific Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
10	Bethune Mary School	2101 San Gabriel Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
11	Birney Elementary School	710 W. Spring St	Long Beach, CA 90806	School
12	Broad Avenue Elementary School	24815 Broad Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
13	Burnett Elementary	565 East Hill St.	Long Beach, CA 90806	School
14	Cabrillo Avenue Elementary School	732 S. Cabrillo Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
15	Cambodian Christian	2474 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	School
16	Cesar Chavez Elementary	730 West Third St.	Long Beach, CA 90802	School
17	Christ Lutheran Elementary School	28850 S. Western Ave	Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275	School
18	Colegio New City	1637 Long Beach Blvd	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
19	Crestwood Street Elementary School	1946 W. Crestwood St	Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275	School
20	Daniel Webster Elementary School and Head Start	1755 W 32nd Way	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
21	Edison Elementary	625 Maine Ave.	Long Beach, CA 90802	School
22	Elizabeth Hudson Elementary School and Development Center Daycare	2335 Webster Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
23	First Baptist Christian School	1360 Broad Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
24	First Baptist Church School	1000 Pine Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
25	First Lutheran Day Care, Preschool and Elementary School	946 Linden Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
26	Fries Ave. Elementary School	1301 N Fries Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
27	Gang Alternative Program	231 Island Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
28	George de la Torre Jr. Elementary School	500 Island Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
29	George Washington Middle School	1450 Cedar Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
30	Gulf Avenue Elementary School	828 W. L St	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
31	Harbor City Elementary School	1508 254th St	Harbor City, CA 90710	School
32	Harbor Occupational Center	740 N. Pacific Ave.	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
33	Harry Bridges Span School	1235 Broad Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
34	Hawaiian Avenue Elementary School	540 Hawaiian Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
35	Holy Family Preschool and Elementary School	1122 E Robidoux St	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
36	Holy Innocents Elementary School	2500 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	School
37	Holy Trinity Elementary School	1226 W. Santa Cruz St	San Pedro, CA 90732	School
38	International Elementary	700 Locust Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	School

No.[b]	Receptor Description	Street Address	City, State, Zip	Category
39	J F Cooper High School	2210 N. Taper Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
40	Jackie Robinson Academy	2750 Pine Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	School
41	James Garfield Elementary School / LBUSD Child Development Center	2240 Baltic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
42	John Muir Elementary School	3038 Delta Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
43	Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo High School	2001 Santa Fe Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
44	Lafayette Elementary School	2445 Chestnut Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	School
45	Leland Street Elementary School	2120 S. Leland St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
46	Long Beach Montessori School	525 E. 7th St	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
47	Mary Star of the Sea Elementary School	717 S. Cabrillo Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
48	Mary Star of the Sea High School	810 W. 8th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
49	Normont Elementary School	1001 253rd St	Harbor City, CA 90710	School
50	Normont Terrace Childrens Center	25028 Petroleum Ave	Harbor City, CA 90710	School
51	Oakwood Academy	2951 Long Beach Blvd	Long Beach, CA 90806	School
52	Pacific Harbor Christian School	1530 N. Wilmington Blvd	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
53	Park Western Place Elementary School	1214 Park Western Place	San Pedro, CA 90732	School
54	Phineas Banning Senior High School	1527 Lakme Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
55	Polytechnic High School	1600Atlantic Ave.	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
56	Port of Los Angeles High School	250 W 5th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
57	Pt. Fermin Elementary School	3333 Kerckhoff Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
58	R H Dana Middle School	1501 S. Cabrillo	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
59	Regency High School	490 W. 14th Street	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
60	Reid Continuation High School	2153 W Hill St	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
61	Renaissance High School for the Arts	235 East Eighth St.	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
62	Rolling Hills Preparatory School	1 Rolling Hills Prep Way	San Pedro, CA 90732	School
63	Roosevelt Elementary	1574 Linden Ave.	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
64	Saint Anthony Preschool / Elementary	855 East Fifth St.	Long Beach, CA 90802	School
65	Saints Peter & Paul School	706 Bay View Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
66	San Pedro High School	1001 W. 15th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
67	San Pedro High School Olguin Campus	3210 S Alma St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
68	San Pedro MST Center	2201 Barrywood Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
69	Savannah Academy	2152 W Hill St	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
70	Select Community Day School	5869 Atlantic Ave.	Long Beach, CA 90802	School
71	St. Anthony High School/Constellation Community Charter Middle	620 Olive Ave.	Long Beach, CA 90802	School
72	St. Lucy School	2320 Cota Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
73	Stevenson Elementary; Stevenson Child Development Centers/Preschool	515 Lime Ave.	Long Beach, CA 90802	School
74	Taper Avenue Elementary School	1824 N. Taper Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
75	The New City School	1230 Pine Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	School
76	Trinity Luthern School	1450 W. 7th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
77	True Social Justice Academy	630 Magnolia Ave	Long Beach, CA 90802	School

No.[b]	Receptor Description	Street Address	City, State, Zip	Category
78	Vermont Christian School	931 Frigate Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
79	White Point Elementary School	1410 Silvius Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
80	Willenberg Special Education	308 S. Weymouth Ave.	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
81	William J. Johnston Community Day School	2210 N Taper Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	School
82	William Logan Stephens Middle School	1830 W Columbia St	Long Beach, CA 90810	School
83	Wilmington Middle School	1700 Gulf Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
84	Wilmington Park Elementary School/Mahar House	1140 Mahar Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
85	Learn4Life Wilmington Assurance Learning Academy	707 W C St	Wilmington, CA 90744	School
86	8th Street Early Head Start	820 Long Beach Blvd	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
87	12th Street Head Start	1212 Long Beach Blvd	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
88	A Love 4 Learning Academy	306 Elm Ave	Long Beach, CA 90802	Child Care
89	ABC 123 Long Beach Learning Center	909 Pine Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
90	Agu Family Child Care	4400 Boyar Ave	Long Beach, CA 90807	Child Care
91	Armstrong Academy	1682 Anaheim St	Harbor City, CA 90710	Child Care
92	Aspiranet Foster Family Agency	1043 Pine Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
93	Atlantic Headstart	1862 Atlantic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
94	Babineaux Family Child Care	2881 Delta Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
95	Benford Family Child Care	530 E 8th St	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
96	Bobo Family Daycare	3532 Delta Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
97	Briggs Family Child Care	Golden Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
98	Brighter Days Montessori	1903 W. Summerland St	San Pedro, CA 90732	Child Care
99	Brown Family Child Care	1831 W Jeanette Pl	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
100	Cabrillo Child Development Center	2205 San Gabriel Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
101	Cabrillo Early Education Center	741 W. 8th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
102	Carmen's Cry Baby Care	1509 S. Palos Verdes St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
103	Carol Daycare	2842 Easy Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
104	Casian Family Child Care	3256 Fashion Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
105	Ceja Family Child Care	2030 W Spring St	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
106	Century Villages at Cabrillo Homeless Housing Community	2001 River Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
107	Child Care Center At St Mary Medical Center	930 Elm Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
108	Childtime Learning Center	1 World Trade Ctr # 199	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
109	City of Long Beach Multi-Service Center; The Play House	1301 W 12th St	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
110	Comprehensive Child Development	2565 Pacific Ave.	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
111	Costa Family Child Care	2085 Easy Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
112	Dahlquist Preschool	1420 W. 7th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
113	Davis Family Child Care	957 W 12th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
114	Day Star Early Learning Center	631 W. 6th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
115	Delgado Family Child Care	3383 Adriatic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
116	Duran, Ramona Family Day Care	2935 Baltic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care

No.[b]	Receptor Description	Street Address	City, State, Zip	Category
117	Edison Child Development Center	640 W 7th St	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
118	Elm Street Head Start	1425 & 1429 Elm Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
119	Fords Family Day Care	2726 San Francisco Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
120	Franklin Day Care Center	2333 Fashion Ave	Carson, CA 90810	Child Care
121	Gallegos Family Child Care	2024 Adriatic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
122	Garcia Family Child Care	2145 Wardlow Rd	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
123	Garfield Head Start	2240 Baltic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
124	Garibay Family Child Care	2172 Lime Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
125	Gomez Family Child Care	1156 Ronan Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
126	Good Shepherd Preschool and Infant Center	1350 W 25th St	San Pedro, CA 90732	Child Care
127	Grace Lutheran Preschool	245 W Wardlow Rd	Long Beach, CA 90807	Child Care
128	Happy Tots Montessori School & Infant Center	1518 Pacific Coast Hwy	Harbor City, CA 90710	Child Care
129	Harbor Area YWCA	437 W 9th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
130	Harbor Day Preschool	580 W 6th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
131	Harbor Hills Early Education Center	1874 Palos Verdes Dr N	Lomita, CA 90717	Child Care
132	Hawaiian Avenue Children's Center	909 W. D St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
133	Hernandez Family Child Care	2200 Golden Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
134	Hernandez Family Child Care	5322 Elm Ave	Long Beach, CA 90805	Child Care
135	Herrera Family Child Care	737 W Hill St	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
136	Jardin De Ninos Home Child Care	1319 W Lowen St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
137	Job Corps Head Start – Daycare and Nursery	1903 Santa Fe Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
138	Jones Family Child Care	2275 Baltic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
139	Just Like Home	1346 W 27th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
140	Kelly's Care	943 N Washington Pl	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
141	Kelly's Kids Daycare Center	855 W Willow St	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
142	Kidazzle Preschool	1921 N Gaffey St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
143	Kim Family Child Care	2035 Linden Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
144	Lara Family Day Care	1303 W 253rd St	Harbor City, CA 90710	Child Care
145	Lil Cowpoke Preschool	445 N Avalon Blvd	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
146	Long Beach Blvd Head Start	2236 Long Beach Blvd	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
147	Long Beach Center for Child Development	622 E. Hill St	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
148	Long Beach Child Development Center	2222 Olive Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
149	Long Beach Day Nursery – West Branch	1548 Chestnut Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
150	Look Who's Learning Pre-School	1491 W O'Farrell St	San Pedro, CA 90732	Child Care
151	Lopez Family Child Care	3500 Fashion Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
152	Loves Family Child Care	527 Daisy Ave	Long Beach, CA 90802	Child Care
153	Loving Day Care	1303 253rd St	Harbor City, CA 90710	Child Care
154	Lucy's Baby Care	940 Maine Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
155	Merry Go Round Nursery School	446 W 8th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
156	Mills Family Daycare	1061 W 17th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care

No.[b]	Receptor Description	Street Address	City, State, Zip	Category
157	Montessori On Elm Preschool + Kindergarten	930 Elm Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
158	Muir Child Development Center	3105 Easy Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
159	Munchkin Center	1348 N Marine Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
160	My First School	25405 Normandie Ave	Harbor City, CA 90710	Child Care
161	N 2 Lil Folkz	1624 Chestnut Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
162	Nero-Morrison Family Child Care	3500 Gale Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
163	New Harbor Vista Child Development Center	909 W D St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
164	Nursery Rhymes Day Care	1410 W. Ofarrell St	San Pedro, CA 90732	Child Care
165	Oakwood Children's Center	2650 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
166	Old King Cole Day Care	3300 Oregon Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
167	P.A.L. Family Day Care	1980 Daisy Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
168	Pacific Head Start	2179 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
169	Park Western Place Children's Center	1220 Park Western Pl	San Pedro, CA 90732	Child Care
170	Patterson Family Child Care	2133 Canal Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
171	Pine Head Start	927 Pine Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
172	Pines Christian Preschool	1516 W Anaheim St	Harbor City, CA 90710	Child Care
173	Poole Family Child Care	2002 Lime Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
174	Reece Family Day Care	911 King Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
175	Robin's Nest Day Care	645 W. 14th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
176	Ruiz Family Daycare	2670 Daisy Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
177	San Pedro – Wilmington Early Education Center	920 W. 36th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
178	San Pedro Child Care	926 W Elberon Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
179	Sanchez Family Child Care	1443 Deepwater Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
180	Sanders Teeny Tiny Preschool	3211 Santa Fe Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Child Care
181	Sandford Family Child Care	215 E Burnett St	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
182	Sar Family Child Care	2171 Pasadena Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
183	Small World Learning Center	1749 N Avalon Blvd	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
184	Smart & Manageable	2054 Myrtle Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
185	Smith Family Daycare	787 W Elberon Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
186	Tender Child Care	211 E 29th St	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
187	Toberman Child Care Center	131 N. Grand Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
188	Un Mundo De Amigos Preschool	1480 Long Beach Blvd	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
189	VOA/Cesar Chavez Head Start	1269 N. Avalon St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
190	Volunteers of America-Parent Child Center	1135 257th St	Harbor City, CA 90710	Child Care
191	West Anaheim Child Care Center	440 W. Anaheim St	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
192	Wilmington Park Children's Center	1419 E Young St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
193	World Tots LA Day Care Center	100 W. 5th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
194	YMCA GLB Fairfield 3rd Street Preschool	607 E. 3rd St	Long Beach, CA 90802	Child Care
195	YMCA Play & Learn Preschool	2179 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
196	Young Horizons Child Development Center	501 Atlantic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90802	Child Care

No.[b]	Receptor Description	Street Address	City, State, Zip	Category
197	Young Horizons Child Development Center	1840 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
198	Young Horizons Child Development Center	2418 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
199	Young Horizons/El Jardin de la Felicidad	507 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Child Care
200	Yvette's Daycare	815 W. Opp St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
201	YWCA Venture Park Pre-School	1921 N. Gaffey St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
202	Zarate Family Child Care	2496 Oregon Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Child Care
203	Rise and Shine WeeCare	388 W 15th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
204	Lisas Home Daycare	326 W 33rd St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
205	Real Family Child Care	444 W 9th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
206	CPDC Child Development Center	769 W 3rd St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
207	Morales Family Childcare	526 W 2nd St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
208	Heritage Tree Daycare	572 W 19th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Child Care
209	Pandas Child Care WeeCare	938 McFarland Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
210	Hawaiian Ave Early Education Center	501 Hawaiian Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care
211	Akin's Post Acute Rehab Hospital; Atlantic Memorial Healthcare Center	2750 Atlantic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Elder Care
212	American AAA Health Care Center	629 N Avalon Blvd	Wilmington, CA 90744	Elder Care
213	American Gold Star Manor Healthcare	3021 Gold Star Dr	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
214	Am's Residential Facility-2	3627 Delta Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
215	Aquarius Home	1765 Aquarius St	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
216	Bay Breeze Care	1653 Santa Fe Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Elder Care
217	Breakers of Long Beach, The	210 E Ocean Blvd	Long Beach, CA 90802	Elder Care
218	Burnett Home Care	1740 W Burnett St	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
219	Cameron Home	W Cameron St	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
220	Caruthers Royale Care	2204 Lime Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Elder Care
221	Crow Flora Boarding & Care Homes	624 W. 9th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Elder Care
222	Deluxe Guest Home	3260 Pine Ave	Long Beach, CA 90807	Elder Care
223	Deluxe Guest Home II	3266 Pine Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Elder Care
224	Garden, The	2485 Cedar Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Elder Care
225	Grandma's House	1218 W D St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Elder Care
226	Harbor Rose Trading Post	1400 S Gaffey St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Elder Care
227	Harbor View House	921 S. Beacon St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Elder Care
228	Harbor View Rehabilitation Center	490 W. 14th Street	Long Beach, CA 90813	Elder Care
229	Hayes Home	2470 Hayes Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
230	Healthview – Pine Villa Assisted Living	117 E 8th St	Long Beach, CA 90813	Elder Care
231	Heritage Board & Care #2	1509 E 4th St	Long Beach, CA 90802	Elder Care
232	Hillcrest Care Center	3401 Cedar Ave	Long Beach, CA 90807	Elder Care
233	Little Sisters of the Poor	2100 S. Western Ave.	San Pedro, CA 90732	Elder Care
234	Loram Manor	1925 Gemini St	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
235	Los Palos Convalescent Hospital	1430 W 6th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Elder Care
236	Olive Tree Home	1035 Olive St	Long Beach, CA 90813	Elder Care

No.[b]	Receptor Description	Street Address	City, State, Zip	Category
237	Pacific Care Nursing Center	3355 Pacific Place	Long Beach, CA 90806	Elder Care
238	Padua House	940 Atlantic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Elder Care
239	Pioneer Homes Of California	2041 W Carolyn Pl	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
240	Reliable Residential Care	1840 Aquarius St	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
241	Right At Home	2245 Elm Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Elder Care
242	RMR Residential Care Facility, LLC	2900 De Forest Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Elder Care
243	Royal Care Skilled Nursing Center	2725 Pacific Avenue	Long Beach, CA 90806	Elder Care
244	Santa Fe Convalescent Hospital	3294 Santa Fe Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Elder Care
245	Seacrest Convalescent Hospital	1416 W 6th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Elder Care
246	Serra Project Long Beach	1043 Elm Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Elder Care
247	Villa Maria Care Center	723 E 9th St	Long Beach, CA 90813	Elder Care
248	Wilmington Gardens	1311 W Anaheim St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Elder Care
249	Anew Direction Adult Living	2300 S Pacific Ave	San Pedro, CA 90731	Elder Care
250	Harbor Terrace Retirement Community	435 W 8th St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Elder Care
251	Earl & Lorraine Miller Children's Hospital; Long Beach Memorial Medical Center and Hospital	2801 Atlantic Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Hospital
252	Kaiser Permanente Foundation Hospital	25825 S. Vermont Ave	Harbor City, CA 90710	Hospital
253	Kaiser Permanente South Bay Medical Center	25825 S Vermont Ave	Harbor City, CA 90710	Hospital
254	Little Company of Mary San Pedro Hospital	1300 W. 7th St	San Pedro, CA 90732	Hospital
255	Long Beach Doctors Hospital	1725 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Hospital
256	Pacific Hospital of Long Beach (Hospital and Convalescent/Nursing Home)	2776 Pacific Ave	Long Beach, CA 90806	Hospital
257	St Mary Medical Center (Hospital and Convalescent/Nursing Home)	1050 Linden Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Hospital
258	Tom Redgate Memorial Hospital	1775 Chestnut Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Hospital
259	Torrance Memorial Medical Center	3330 Lomita Blvd	Torrance, CA 90505	Hospital
260	Bloch Field	1500 Harbor Blvd	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
261	Admiral Kidd Park	2125 Santa Fe Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Recreational
262	Cesar Chavez Park	401 Golden Ave	Long Beach, CA 90802	Recreational
263	Field of Dreams	501 Westmont Drive	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
264	Gaffey Street Community Gardens	1400 N Gaffey Street	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
265	Harbor Japanese Community Cultural Center	1766 Seabright Ave	Long Beach, CA 90813	Recreational
266	Hudson Park	2335 Webster Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Recreational
267	Hudson Park Community Garden	2335 Webster Ave	Long Beach, CA 90810	Recreational
268	Khemara Buddhikaram Cambodian Buddhist Temple	2100 W Willow Street	Long Beach, CA 90810	Recreational
269	Knoll Hill Baseball Fields	766 Eastview Little League Drive	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
270	Knoll Hill Dog Park	705-711 N Front Street	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
271	Pramuan Simsriwatna Place of Worship	2015 W Hill Street	Long Beach, CA 90810	Recreational
272	San Pedro Plaza Park	7000 S Beacon Street	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
273	San Pedro Plaza Park	7000 S Beacon Street	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
274	San Pedro Plaza Park	7000 S Beacon Street	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational

No.[b]	Receptor Description	Street Address	City, State, Zip	Category
275	Silverado Park Community Center	1545 W 31st Street	Long Beach, CA 90810	Recreational
276	Wilmington Waterfront Park	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
277	Wilmington Waterfront Park	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
278	Wilmington Waterfront Park	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
279	AltaSea	2451 Signal St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
280	Cabrillo Beach	720 Stephen M. White Dr.	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
281	Cabrillo Beach Youth Waterfront Sports Center	3000 Shoshonean Rd	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
282	22nd Street Park	140 W 22nd St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
283	Battleship USS Iowa	250 Harbor Blvd	Los Angeles, CA 90731	Recreational
284	Los Angeles World Cruise Center	100 Swinford St	San Pedro, CA 90731	Recreational
285	Wilmington Urgent Care and Family Clinic	714 N Avalon Blvd	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
286	Beacon Light Mission	525 Broad Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
287	Harbor Community Teen Center	612 W E St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
288	Wilmington Recreation Center	325 N Neptune Ave	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
289	Coastal Comprehensive Treatment Center	117 E Harry Bridges Blvd	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
290	USC Boathouse[c]	400 Yacht St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
291	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
292	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
293	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
294	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
295	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
296	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
297	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
298	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
299	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
300	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
301	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
302	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
303	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
304	Wilmington Waterfront Promenade	S. C Street	Wilmington, CA 90744	Recreational
305	Banning's Landing Community Center[c]	100 E Water St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care/Recreational
306	Banning's Landing Community Center[c]	100 E Water St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care/Recreational
307	Banning's Landing Community Center[c]	100 E Water St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care/Recreational
308	Banning's Landing Community Center[c]	100 E Water St	Wilmington, CA 90744	Child Care/Recreational

Notes:
[a] This table summarizes the non-residential sensitive receptors.
[b] The receptor numbers correspond to receptor labels in Figure B3-3.
[c] Los Angeles World Cruise Center and Knoll Hill Baseball Fields are the two nearest non-residential sensitive receptors to the proposed facility.

MEI locations were selected from the modeled receptor grids for three different receptor types: residential, sensitive (non-residential), and occupational (i.e., the off-site workers). The selection methodology for the MEI locations was:

- The residential MEI was selected from all receptors in residential or residentially-zoned areas that are not located within modeled roadways or railways. Marinas where liveaboards may be present were treated as valid residential receptors.
- The non-residential sensitive MEI was selected from all non-residential sensitive receptors identified near the Proposed Project as shown in Table B3-2 and Figure B3-3 including schools, childcare centers, elder care facilities, hospitals, and recreational areas such as parks, marinas, and public waterfront areas. These non-residential sensitive receptors were treated conservatively with resident exposure.
- The occupational MEI was selected from all industrial/commercial receptors outside the proposed facility boundary that are not located on water or within modeled roadways or railways.

4.0 Health Risk Assessment Approach

The HRA was performed based on the modeled TAC concentrations, following methods recommended by OEHHA (OEHHA 2015) and SCAQMD (SCAQMD 2025) with the use of software HARP2 RAST, version 22118 (CARB 2022). Values for individual cancer risk, chronic HI, and acute HI at each modeled receptor for the Project and alternative scenarios were calculated. For each quantitatively evaluated receptor type (i.e., residential, non-residential sensitive, and occupational), the modeled receptor with the highest heath risk estimate was selected for reporting and comparison to the appropriate significance threshold.

4.1 Toxicity Assessment

The toxicity assessment (also referred to as the dose-response assessment) examines the potential for a TAC to cause adverse health effects in exposed individuals. Toxicity values that were used to estimate the likelihood of adverse effects from the TACs listed in Section 2.3 were identified in this component of the HRA process.

Cancer potency factors established by CARB (CARB 2023) were used to evaluate the probability that a person will contract cancer from the continuous exposures of carcinogenic TACs over the evaluated exposure period using the risk assessment methodology defined in OEHHA Hot Spots Guidance (OEHHA 2015).

To assess the potential for non-cancer health effects resulting from chronic and acute inhalation exposure, OEHHA has established chronic and acute RELs for evaluating the adverse health effects for TACs through the inhalation pathway and oral reference doses (RfDs) for the multi-pathway TACs through the non-inhalation pathway exposures (CARB 2023; see further discussions on the exposure pathways in section 4.2). An REL is an estimate of the continuous inhalation exposure concentration to which the human population (including sensitive subgroups such as children, pregnant and nursing women, and the elderly) may be exposed without appreciable risk of experiencing adverse non-cancer effects. RfD is an estimate of a daily exposure to the human population (including sensitive subgroups) that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of deleterious effects during a lifetime through the non-inhalation pathways. Chronic HI is the sum of the

chemical-specific chronic hazard quotients (HQs) affecting a particular target organ. The acute HI is the sum of the chemical-specific acute HQs affecting a particular target organ (e.g., respiratory system, central nervous system, etc.). An HQ is a chemical's predicted concentration divided by its REL for the inhalation pathway, and/or the chemical's calculated daily average dose divided by its RfD for the inhalation pathways. A separate HI is calculated for each target organ affected by the TACs because not all TACs affect the same target organ. A HI below 1.0 for all affected target organs indicates that adverse non-cancer health effects are not expected.

Table B3-3 presents the toxicity factors used to assess health risks in this study.

Table B3-3. Toxicity Values Used In the HRA

Toxic Air Contaminant	CASRN	Inhalation Cancer Potency Factor $(mg/kg\text{-}d)^{-1}$	Chronic Inhalation REL ($\mu g/m^3$)	Target Organ for Chronic Exposure[a]	Acute Inhalation REL ($\mu g/m^3$)	Target Organ for Acute Exposure[a]	Multipath Chemicals[b]
Acetaldehyde	75-07-0	0.01	140	I	470	D,I	No
Acrolein	107-02-8	--	0.35	I	2.5	D,I	No
Arsenic[c]	7440-38-2	12	0.015	B,C,G,I,J	0.2	B,C,G	Yes
Benzene	71-43-2	0.1	3	E	27	C,E,F	No
Bromine	7726-95-6	--	--	--	--	--	No
1,3-Butadiene	106-99-0	0.6	2	C	660	C	No
Chlorine	7782-50-5	--	0.2	I	210	D,I	No
Chromium III	16065-83-1	--	0.06	--	0.48	--	No
Copper	7440-50-8	--	--	--	100	I	No
DPM	9-90-1	1.1	5	I	--	--	No
Ethyl benzene	100-41-4	0.0087	2,000	A,C,L,M	--	--	No
Formaldehyde	50-00-0	0.021	9	I	55	D	No
Hexane	110-54-3	--	7,000	G	--	--	No
Hexavalent Chromium[c]	18540-29-9	510	0.2	E,I	--	--	Yes
Lead[a]	7439-92-1	0.042	--	--	--	--	Yes
Manganese	7439-96-5	--	0.09	G	--	--	No
Methanol	67-56-1	--	4,000	C	28,000	G	No
Methyl ethyl ketone	78-93-3	--	--	--	13,000	D,I	No
Naphthalene	91-20-3	0.12	9	I	--	--	No
Nickel[c]	7440-02-0	0.91	0.014	C,E,I	0.2	F	Yes
Propylene	115-07-1	--	3,000	I	--	--	No
Selenium[c]	7782-49-2	--	20	A,B,G	--	--	Yes
Styrene	100-42-5	--	900	G	21,000	C,D,I	No
Sulfates	9-96-0	--	--	--	120	I	No
Toluene	108-88-3	--	300	C,G,I	37,000	C,D,G,I	No
Vanadium	7440-62-2	--	--	--	30	D,I	No
Xylenes	1330-20-7	--	700	D,G,I	22,000	D,G,I	No

Source: CARB, 2023. Consolidated Table of OEHHA/ARB Approved Risk Assessment Health Values. October.
Notes:
-- = not available
[a] Key to non-cancer acute and chronic exposure target organs:

A = Alimentary Tract
G = Nervous System
B = Cardiovascular System
I = Respiratory System
C = Reproductive/Developmental System
J = Skin
CASRN = Chemical Abstract Services Registry Number
K = Bone
D = Eye
L = Endocrine System
E = Hematologic System
M = Kidney
F = Immune System

[b] Based on the multipath chemicals recommended by OEHHA (2015) for evaluation of health impacts through the non-inhalation pathways.
[c] Arsenic, hexavalent chromium, lead, nickel, and selenium were also evaluated for non-inhalation exposure pathways. For arsenic, the cancer risk oral slope factor is 1.5 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$, and the noncancer chronic oral REL is 0.0000035 mg/kg/day. For hexavalent chromium, the cancer risk oral slope factor is 0.5 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$, and the noncancer chronic oral REL is 0.02 mg/kg/day. For lead, the cancer risk oral slope factor is 0.0085 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$. For nickel, the noncancer chronic oral REL is 0.011 mg/kg/day. For selenium, the noncancer chronic oral REL is 0.005 mg/kg/day.

4.2 Exposure Assessment

Potentially Exposed Populations: As discussed in Section 1, this analysis conservatively evaluated following receptor types, which is expected to yield the highest impacts:

- Residents;
- Non-residential sensitive receptors (conservatively evaluated with residential exposure assumptions); and
- Off-site workers.

The residential exposure assumptions are conservative for other non-residential sensitive receptor types (i.e., schools, child care centers, hospitals, elder cares, and recreational areas) as residential uses have the longest exposure time, exposure duration and highest exposure frequency. A conservative approach of evaluating all non-residential sensitive receptors using residential exposure assumptions was used in this HRA.

Exposure Pathways and Assumptions: When there are multi-pathway chemicals identified in the TACs to evaluate in the HRA, OEHHA Hot Spots Guidance (OEHHA 2015) requires the evaluation of both inhalation and non-inhalation exposure pathways (the latter is also referred to as a multi-pathway analysis) for selected multi-pathway chemicals and land use designations in the area being evaluated. Arsenic, cadmium, hexavalent chromium, lead, mercury, nickel, and selenium are multi-pathway chemicals as defined by OEHHA (2015). Consistent with the recommendations of the OEHHA (OEHHA 2015) and SCAQMD (2025) for conducting a multi-pathway analysis, in addition to the inhalation, several non-inhalation exposure pathways were also evaluated in the HRA, including dermal contact with soil, soil ingestion, home-grown produce ingestion, and mother's milk ingestion (the latter two pathways were only evaluated for the residential exposure scenario).

The exposure parameters used to estimate cancer risks for the inhalation pathway for residents and workers were obtained using risk assessment guidelines from OEHHA (2015) and SCAQMD (2025). For off-site workers in the warehouse at the Berth 153 building, which is located immediately outside the eastern boundary of the Proposed Project facility, the risk analysis incorporated site-specific exposure parameters based on the actual time workers spend accessing and working within the warehouse. All exposure parameters used to calculate intake factors are presented in Table B3-4. Ramboll conducted the multi-pathway analysis using the HARP2 RAST software (CARB 2022), which incorporates the OEHHA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program guidelines (OEHHA 2015) using exposure assumptions under the OEHHA derived method in RAST software.

Calculation of Intake: The dose estimated for each exposure pathway is a function of the concentration of a chemical and the intake of that chemical. The intake factor for inhalation (IF_{inh}) was calculated as follows:

$$IF_{inh} = \frac{DBR * ET * EF * ED * FAH * CF}{AT}$$

Where:

IF_{inh} = Intake Factor for inhalation (m^3/kg-day)
DBR = Daily Breathing Rate (L/kg-day)
ET = Exposure Time (hours/24 hours)
EF = Exposure Frequency (days/year)

ED = Exposure Duration (years)
AT = Averaging Time (days)
FAH = Fraction of time at Home
CF = Conversion Factor, 0.001 (m^3/L)

The chemical intake or dose was estimated by multiplying the inhalation intake factor, IF_{inh}, by the chemical concentration in air (C_i). When coupled with the chemical concentration, this calculation is mathematically equivalent to the dose algorithm given in OEHHA guidance (OEHHA 2015).

4.3 Risk Characterization

4.3.1 Estimation of Individual Cancer Risk

Individual cancer risks were estimated as the upper-bound incremental probability that an individual will develop cancer over a lifetime as a direct result of exposure to potential carcinogens. The estimated risk was expressed as a unitless probability. The cancer risk attributed to a chemical was calculated by multiplying the chemical intake or dose at the human exchange boundaries (e.g., lungs) by the chemical-specific cancer potency factor (CPF).

The equation used to calculate the potential excess lifetime cancer risk for the inhalation pathway is as follows:

$$Risk_{inh} = C_i \times CF \times IF_{inh} \times CPF_i \times ASF$$

Where:

$Risk_{inh}$ = Cancer risk for the inhalation pathway (unitless)
Ci = Annual average air concentration for $chemical_i$ ($\mu g/m^3$)
CF = Conversion Factor (mg/µg)
IF_{inh} = Intake Factor for inhalation (m^3/kg-day)
CPF_i = Cancer Potency Factor for $chemical_i$
(mg chemical/kg body weight-day)$^{-1}$
ASF = Age Sensitivity Factor (unitless)

According to OEHHA (2015), the estimated excess lifetime cancer risks for a resident were adjusted using the age sensitivity factors (ASFs) recommended in the OEHHA Technical Support Document (TSD) (OEHHA 2009). This approach accounted for an "anticipated special sensitivity to carcinogens" of infants and children. Cancer risk estimates were weighted by a factor of 10 for exposures that occur from the third trimester of pregnancy to two years of age (labeled by OEHHA as "3rd trimester" and "0 < 2", respectively), and by a factor of three for exposures that occur from two years through 15 years of age ("2 < 16"). No weighting factor (i.e., an ASF of one, which is equivalent to no adjustment) was applied to ages 16 and older.

Because the Proposed Project and Floating Future Baseline have emissions that change over time in the HRA, it was necessary to subdivide the exposure durations listed in Table B3-4 into smaller time periods (sub-periods) and calculate risks and hazards separately for each sub-period. These sub-periods correspond to the years when the modeled receptor's age falls within the ranges defined by the age sensitivity factors and daily breathing rates ("3rd Trimester", "0 < 2", "2 < 16", and "≥ 16").

For each receptor type, the most conservative (highest) exposure scenario was evaluated to estimate cancer risk results. For example, the calculation of a 30-year residential cancer risk assumes that the exposed person is in the 3rd trimester before birth at the beginning of the 30-year exposure period because the childhood age sensitivity factor (ASF) used in the cancer risk calculation is the highest for age groups 3rd trimester and 0<2. Moreover, the calculated cancer risk is increased even further during childhood years by using higher breathing rates per body weight than adults.

For each sub-period, the average annual or baseline emissions that would occur during that sub-period were used. The cancer risk results for each sub-period were then summed to obtain the total cancer risk for the entire exposure duration. For example, the 30-year residential cancer risk was determined for each of four sub-periods. The first sub-period represents a receptor age of "3rd Trimester" and assumes an exposure duration of 0.25 year; and uses Proposed Project operations and overlapping construction emissions in 2027 (scaled down to a three-month duration from January to March 2027). The second sub-period represents a receptor age of "0 - < 2" assumes an exposure duration of 2 years; and uses Proposed Project operations and overlapping construction emissions averaged over the time period April 2027 - March 2029. The third sub-period represents a receptor age of "2 < 16" assumes an exposure duration of 14 years; and uses Proposed Project operational and overlapping construction emissions averaged over the time period April to December 2029 and Proposed Project operational emissions averaged over the time period from January 2030 to March 2043. The fourth sub-period represents a receptor age of ">16" assumes an exposure duration of 14 years; and uses Proposed Project operational emissions averaged over the time period April 2043 - March 2057. The cancer risks calculated for these four sub-periods were then summed to obtain the total cancer risks for the entire exposure duration of 30 years[4].

Based on land use information and SCAQMD's recommendation, residential and non-residential sensitive receptors were evaluated for inhalation, soil ingestion, dermal contact, mother's milk ingestion, and homegrown garden ingestion pathways; occupational receptors were evaluated for inhalation, soil ingestion, and dermal contact pathways. The evaluation of the non-inhalation pathways was conducted with the help of OEHHA developed HRA software HARP2 RAST. Assumptions of the OEHHA derived method were used to evaluate the cancer risks for the non-inhalation pathways. A deposition settling velocity of 0.05 meters per second was assumed in HARP2 RAST.

Table B3-4. Cancer Risk Exposure Assumptions by Receptor Type

Receptor Type[a]	Scenario[b]	Age Group	Exposure Frequency[c] (days/year)	Exposure Time[c] (hours/day)	Exposure Duration[c] (year)	Daily Breathing Rate[c] (L/kg-day)	Fraction of Time at Home (FAH)[d] (unitless)	ASF[e] (unit-less)	MAF[f] (unit-less)	Approach for Multi-Pathway Analysis[g]
Resident - Individual Cancer Risk (30 years)	Construction Scenario	3rd Trimester	350	24	0.25	361	1	10	1	Derived OEHHA Method
		0-<2 years	350	24	2	1090	1	10		
		2-<16 years	350	24	0.75	572	1	3		
		3rd Trimester	350	24	0.25	361	1	10		

[4] In accordance with OEHHA's Hot Spots Guidance (OEHHA 2015), the exposure during the 3rd trimester before birth is also included in the cancer risk evaluation for a resident. Therefore, the total exposure duration for evaluating individual cancer risk for a resident is 30.25 years.

Receptor Type[a]	Scenario[b]	Age Group	Exposure Frequency[c] (days/year)	Exposure Time[c] (hours/day)	Exposure Duration[c] (year)	Daily Breathing Rate[c] (L/kg-day)	Fraction of Time at Home (FAH)[d] (unitless)	ASF[e] (unit-less)	MAF[f] (unit-less)	Approach for Multi-Pathway Analysis[g]
	Operation Scenario	0-<2 years	350	24	2	1090	1	10		
		2-<16 years	350	24	14	572	1	3		
		16-<30 years	350	24	14	261	0.73	1		
Resident - Population Cancer Burden (70 years)	Construction Scenario	3rd Trimester	350	24	0.25	361	1	10		
		0-<2 years	350	24	2	1091	1	10		
		2-<16 years	350	24	0.75	572	1	3		
	Operation Scenario	3rd Trimester	350	24	0.25	361	1	10		
		0-<2 years	350	24	2	1090	1	10		
		2-<16 years	350	24	14	572	1	3		
		16-<70 years	350	24	54	233	0.73	1		
Commercial/Industrial Workers	Construction Scenario	16-<70 years	250	8	3	230	--	1	see note f	
	Operation Scenario	16-<70 years	250	8	22	230	--	1		
Commercial/Industrial Workers (Warehouse)[h]	Construction Scenario	16-<70 years	50	3	3	86	--	1	see note f	
	Operation Scenario	16-<70 years	50	3	22	86	--	1		

Sources:

OEHHA 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines. Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. February.

SCAQMD 2025. AB2588 & Rule 1402 Supplemental Guidelines: Supplemental Guideline for Preparing Risk Assessments and Risk Reduction Plan for the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act. October.

Notes:

[a] LAHD conservatively evaluated other sensitive receptors (i.e. schools, hospitals, elder care, child care and recreational areas) using the 30-year residential exposure assumptions from OEHHA (2015).

[b] The Proposed Project was evaluated for both construction and operation scenarios. The 2021 Baseline and Floating Future Baseline scenarios were evaluated for operation scenario. The construction period is from 2024 to 2029. The initial year of the Proposed Project scenario's exposure period was assumed to be 2027 which corresponds to the highest emissions year due to overlapping of Proposed Project construction and full operations emissions and results in the most conservative estimates of health risks.

[c] The exposure assumptions for residential and commercial/industrial receptors were obtained from OEHHA (2015) and SCAQMD (2025). In accordance with the recommendation from CARB's Risk Management Policy (RMP) and the SCAQMD (2025) for residential receptors, this analysis uses the 95th percentile of the breathing rates for children from the 3rd trimester through age 2, and 80th percentile breathing rates for all other age groups for the residents.

[d] Fraction of time spent at home is conservatively assumed to be 1 (i.e., 24 hours/day) for age groups from the third trimester to less than 16 years old. Based on the OEHHA 2015 Guidance, the age group 16 to 30 years old is estimated to be at school or work for 6.5 hours of the day. Therefore, the fraction of time spent at home is assumed to be 0.73 (17.5 hours/24 hours per day) for this age group.

[e] The age sensitivity factors (ASF) are as recommended in the 2015 OEHHA Hot Spots Guidance (OEHHA 2015) for each age group.

[f] The construction emissions from all sources are from 6 AM to 4 PM on Monday through Friday; the operation emissions source groups are assumed to emit 24 hours/day, 7 days a week starting from 2027. In accordance with OEHHA's recommendation (OEHHA 2015), a modeling adjustment factor (MAF) was applied to the annual average concentrations used in the evaluation for the workers to account for a construction emission schedule of 10 hours/day, 5 days a week. The residents were assumed to be exposed to the construction emissions continuously, therefore no adjustment is needed in the calculation of exposure point concentrations for the residents.

[g] The "OEHHA Derived Method" is recommended by the SCAQMD (2025) for evaluating multi-pathway exposures. It uses the high-end (95th percentile) exposure parameters for the top two dominant exposure pathways (one of which is nearly always inhalation), and average exposure parameters for the remaining pathways.

[h] Commercial/industrial receptors in the warehouse at the Berth 153 building, located immediately outside the eastern boundary of the Proposed Project facility, are assumed to be exposed for 3 hours per week, 50 weeks per year, over a 25-year period. The default 95th-percentile 8-hour breathing rate for moderate activities (230 L/kg-day) was adjusted to a 3-hour exposure duration using a scaling factor of 3/8.

ASF = Age Sensitivity Factor
MAF = Modeling Adjustment Factor
L/kg-day = liter per kilogram body weight per da

4.3.2 Population Cancer Burden

Population cancer burden is defined by OEHHA as an estimate of the number of cancer cases expected from a 70-year exposure to emissions (OEHHA 2015). Whereas individual cancer risk represents the probability of a single exposed person to develop cancer, population cancer burden estimates the number of individuals that would be expected to contract cancer by multiplying the individual excess lifetime cancer risk by the population exposed to that level of risk, calculated at the census tract or block level.

The individual cancer risk is calculated assuming a 70-year exposure period assuming that the exposed person is in the 3rd trimester before birth at the beginning of the exposure period based on OEHHA's recommendation (OEHHA 2015). The exposed population is defined as the number of people living within a facility's zone of impact, which is defined by the LAHD and SCAQMD as the area within a project's one-in-a-million cancer risk contour line (isopleth). Population cancer burdens were calculated using census block population data contained in HARP2, which are based on the 2020 U.S. Census. The centroid of each census block was modeled in AERMOD for the purpose of cancer burden analysis.

4.3.3 Non-Cancer Chronic and Acute HI

4.3.3.1 Chronic HI

The potential for exposure to result in adverse chronic non-cancer effects for the inhalation pathway is evaluated by comparing the estimated annual average air concentration (which is equivalent to the average daily air concentration) to the non-cancer chronic reference exposure level (cREL) for each chemical. When calculated for a single chemical, the comparison yields a ratio termed an HQ. To evaluate the potential for adverse chronic non-cancer health effects from simultaneous exposure to multiple chemicals, the HQs for all chemicals that affect a common target organ are summed, yielding an HI.

$$HQ_i = C_i / cREL_i$$

$$HI = \sum HQ_i$$

Where:

HQ_i	=	Chronic hazard quotient for chemical_i
HI	=	Hazard index
C_i	=	Annual average concentration of chemical_i ($\mu g/m^3$)
$cREL_i$	=	Chronic reference exposure level for chemical_i ($\mu g/m^3$)

As discussed in Section 4.4.1, based on land use information and SCAQMD's recommendation, residential and non-residential sensitive receptors were also evaluated for soil ingestion, dermal contact, mother's milk ingestion, and homegrown garden ingestion pathways; occupational receptors were also evaluated for soil ingestion and

dermal contact pathways. The evaluation of the health risks for the non-inhalation pathways were conducted with the use of OEHHA-developed HRA software HARP2 RAST. Assumptions of the OEHHA-derived method were used to evaluate the chronic non-cancer hazard indices for the non-inhalation pathways. A deposition settling velocity of 0.05 meters per second was conservatively assumed in HARP2 RAST (SCAQMD 2025).

4.3.3.2 Acute HI

The potential for exposure to result in adverse acute effects is evaluated by comparing the estimated one-hour maximum air concentration of a chemical to the acute reference exposure level (aREL) for each chemical evaluated in this analysis at each receptor location. When calculated for a single chemical, the comparison yields an HQ. To evaluate the potential for adverse acute health effects from simultaneous exposure to multiple chemicals, the HQs for all chemicals that affect a common target organ are summed, yielding an HI. All receptors were evaluated for inhalation exposure pathway only for the acute HI.

$$HQ_i = C_i \Big/ aREL_i$$

$$HI = \sum HQ_i$$

Where:

HQ_i	=	Acute Hazard Quotient for chemical i
HI	=	Hazard Index
C_i	=	One-hour maximum concentration of chemical_i ($\mu g/m^3$)
$aREL_i$	=	Acute Reference Exposure Level for chemical_i ($\mu g/m^3$)

5.0 Significance Criteria

The SCAQMD significance threshold for individual cancer risk (project increment) is 10 in a million (1×10^{-5}). Based on this threshold, the Proposed Project would produce less than significant cancer risk impacts if the maximum cancer risk were less than 10 in a million (10×10^{-6}). The air quality significance threshold for cancer burden is 0.5 excess cancer cases in areas with Project-attributable individual cancer risk above one in a million (1×10^{-6}) (SCAQMD 2023). According to state and federal guidance, a cancer risk that is at or below one in a million (1×10^{-6}) is not a public health concern for a site. This means that no more than one person in a population of one million people exposed to the same level of chemical contaminant(s) at the site would develop cancer over a lifetime. State regulators consider a variety of factors to determine the risk threshold between 1×10^{-6} and 1×10^{-4}.[5] In addition, the SCAQMD significance threshold is 1.0 for chronic and acute non-cancer hazard indices; the Proposed Project would produce less than significant non-cancer impacts if the chronic and acute hazard indices are less than 1.0 (SCAQMD 2023).

[5] The National Contingency Plan (NCP) (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] § 300) is commonly cited as the basis for target cancer risk. According to the NCP, excess lifetime cancer risks posed by a site should not exceed one in a million (1×10^{-6}) to one hundred in a million (1×10^{-4}).

6.0 Predicted Incremental Health Impacts

Table B3-5 presents the maximum predicted incremental health impacts of the Proposed Project relative to the 2021 Baseline and Floating Future Baseline. The table includes estimates of individual cancer risk, chronic noncancer hazard index, and acute noncancer hazard index at the maximally exposed residential, occupational, and non-residential sensitive receptors. Results are presented for the Proposed Project (before subtracting baseline), 2021 Baseline, Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline increment, Floating Future Baseline, and the Proposed Project Minus Floating Future Baseline increment (the latter two categories are applicable only to cancer risk). The table also presents the population cancer burden increments for the Proposed Project relative to the 2021 Baseline and Floating Future Baseline. Significance findings are made by comparing the health impacts to the significance thresholds.

Figure B3-4 shows the locations of the maximum residential/sensitive receptor and individual cancer risk contours of the Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline, assuming residential (30-year) exposure parameters. Figure B3-5 shows the same results but for the Proposed Project minus the Floating Future Baseline.

Figure B3-6 shows the locations of the maximum occupational receptor and individual cancer risk contours of the Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline, assuming occupational (25-year) exposure parameters. Figure B3-7 shows the same results but for the Proposed Project minus the Floating Future Baseline.

These results are described further in Section 6.1.

Table B3-5. Maximum Health Impacts Estimated for Construction and Operation of the Proposed Project

Health Impact	Receptor Type	Proposed Project[a]	2021 Baseline	Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline[b]	Floating Future Baseline	Proposed Project Minus Floating Future Baseline[c]	Significance Threshold	Threshold Exceeded?
Individual Cancer Risk	Residential	7.2×10^{-6}	4.1×10^{-6}	3.1×10^{-6}	3.9×10^{-6}	3.2×10^{-6}	10×10^{-6} (10 in a million)	No
		7.2 in a million	4.1 in a million	3.1 in a million	3.9 in a million	3.2 in a million		
	Non-Residential Sensitive[d]	1.3×10^{-5}	6.7×10^{-6}	6.4×10^{-6}	6.2×10^{-6}	6.9×10^{-6}		No
		13 in a million	6.7 in a million	6.4 in a million	6.2 in a million	6.9 in a million		
	Occupational	9.6×10^{-6}	8.0×10^{-6}	6.0×10^{-6}	8.1×10^{-6}	6.0×10^{-6}		No
		9.6 in a million	8.0 in a million	6.0 in a million	8.1 in a million	6.0 in a million		
Chronic Hazard Index	Residential	0.0045	0.0036	0.00090	n/a[e]	n/a[e]	1	No
	Non-Residential Sensitive	0.0081	0.0059	0.0023	n/a[e]	n/a[e]		No
	Occupational	0.16	0.035	0.14	n/a[e]	n/a[e]		No
Acute Hazard Index	All Populations	0.056	0.046	0.048	n/a[e]	n/a[e]	1	No
Population Cancer Burden			**Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline increment**		**Proposed Project Minus Floating Future Baseline Increment**		0.5	No
			0.18		0.42			

Notes:

[a] The "Proposed Project" column represents the maximum Proposed Project health values prior to subtracting the baselines.

[b] The "Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline" column represents the maximum difference of the Proposed Project minus the 2021 Baseline. The maximum health values for the "Proposed Project", "2021 Baseline", and "Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline" shown in the table may not occur at the same receptor location. Therefore, the maximum health values for the "Proposed Project" and "2021 Baseline" may not necessarily subtract to equal the maximum health value for the "Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline". The same is true for the "Proposed Project", "Floating Future Baseline", and "Proposed Project Minus Floating Future Baseline" maximum health values. The example given in the text provides more explanation on the determination of maximum health values.

[c] The "Proposed Project Minus Floating Future Baseline" column represents the maximum difference of the Proposed Project minus the Floating Future Baseline.

[d] The non-residential sensitive receptor location with the maximum incremental cancer risk is located at the Los Angeles World Cruise Center, which is located approximately 870 meters southwest of the Project site.

[e] The "Floating Future Baseline" and "Proposed Project Minus Floating Future Baseline" are applicable only to cancer risk because cancer risk has a uniquely long exposure period (30 years for residential and sensitive exposure, and 70 years for population cancer burden), while the chronic and acute HIs are based on modeled TAC concentrations of one year and one hour within the baseline period, respectively, and do not involve changes across time.

Figure B3-4. Isopleths of 30-Year Incremental Residential Cancer Risks – Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline




Figure B3-5. Isopleths of 30-Year Incremental Residential Cancer Risks – Proposed Project Minus Future Floating Baseline




Figure B3-6. Isopleths of 25-year Incremental Occupational Cancer Risks – Proposed Project Minus 2021 Baseline



Figure B3-7. Isopleths of 25-year Incremental Occupational Cancer Risks – Proposed Project Minus Future Floating Baseline



It is worth noting that the maximum health impacts for the Proposed Project (before subtracting baselines), 2021 Baseline, and Proposed Project increments (i.e., Proposed Project minus 2021 Baseline and Proposed Project minus Floating Future Baseline) in Table B3-5 do not always occur at the same receptor location. This means that the displayed maximum Proposed Project increments are not necessarily equal to the displayed maximum Proposed Project impacts minus the displayed maximum 2021 Baseline impacts. An increment was calculated at each modeled receptor, and the receptor with the highest increment is presented in the table.

The health impacts for the Proposed Project relative to the 2021 Baseline and Floating Future Baseline are summarized and discussed in Sections 6.1 through 6.3 for each evaluated health endpoint.

6.1 Individual Cancer Risk

As shown in Table B3-5, the maximum individual cancer risk increments for the Proposed Project relative to both the 2021 Baseline and Floating Future Baseline are predicted to be less than the SCAQMD significance threshold of 10 in a million for the residential, non-residential sensitive, and occupational populations. Therefore, the impact of individual cancer risk increments for the Proposed Project would be less than significant for all three types of populations.

Figure B3-4 shows the individual residential cancer risk contours generated using the incremental cancer risk relative to the 2021 Baseline estimates calculated based on the default 30-year residential assumptions at each modeled receptor regardless of whether it is an actual residential receptor in relation to the 2021 Baseline. This figure also shows the location of the MEI receptors for the residential/non-residential sensitive receptors for the Proposed Project. As shown in this figure, the 10 in a million contour does not overlap with any residential zones. The residential MEI receptor for cancer risk (with an estimated incremental cancer risk of 3.1 in a million which is below the 10 in a million threshold), is located southwest of the Proposed Project facility in a residential neighborhood near W. Amar Street and N. Palos Verdes Street in San Pedro. The MEI non-residential sensitive receptor with an estimated incremental cancer risk of 6.4 in a million (also below the 10 in a million threshold) is located at the Los Angeles World Cruise Center, which is approximately 870 meters southwest of the Project site. Because the cancer risk for this receptor location was conservatively evaluated as residents assuming continuous exposure for 30 years, the actual risks for the recreational users at this location are expected to be much lower and are less than significant.

Figure B3-5 individual residential cancer risk contours generated using the incremental cancer risk estimates relative to the Future Floating Baseline calculated based on the default 30-year residential assumptions at each modeled receptor regardless of whether it is an actual residential receptor in relation to the Future Floating Baseline. This figure also shows the locations of the MEI receptors for the residential/non-residential sensitive receptors for the Proposed Project. The cancer risk increment relative to the Future Floating Baseline for the MEI residential receptor is estimated to be 3.2 in a million (in comparison to the 10 in a million threshold) and is located southwest of the Proposed Project facility in a residential neighborhood near West Amar Street and North Palos Verdes Street. The cancer risk increment relative to the Future Floating Baseline for the MEI non-residential sensitive receptor is estimated to be 6.9 in a million (in comparison to the 10 in a million threshold) and is located southwest of the Proposed Project facility at the Los Angeles World Cruise Center. As these risk increments are below the 10 in a million threshold (see Section 5.0), they are less than significant.

Figure B3-6 shows the shows the individual worker cancer risk contours generated using the incremental cancer risk estimates relative to the 2021 Baseline calculated based on the default occupational exposure assumptions at each modeled receptor (regardless of whether it is an actual occupational receptor) in relation to the 2021 Baseline. This figure also shows the location of the MEI occupational receptor for the Proposed Project. The worker risk contours were generated using cancer risk estimates calculated based on the default occupational exposure assumptions at each modeled receptor (regardless of

whether it is an actual occupational receptor). The occupational MEI receptor for cancer risk, which is estimated to be 6.0 in a million (below the 10 in a million threshold), is located immediately outside the eastern boundary of the Proposed Project facility at the Berth 153 building. As these risk increments are below the 10 in a million threshold (see Section 5.0), they are less than significant.

Figure B3-7 shows the individual worker cancer risk contours generated using the incremental cancer risk estimates relative to the Future Floating Baseline calculated based on the default occupational exposure assumptions at each modeled receptor (regardless of whether it is an actual occupational receptor) in relation to the Future Floating Baseline. This figure also shows the location of the MEI occupational receptor for the Proposed Project. The cancer risk increment relative to the Future Floating Baseline for the MEI occupational receptor is estimated to be 6.0 in a million (also below the 10 in a million threshold) and is also located right outside the eastern boundary of the Proposed Project facility at the Berth 153 building. As these risk increments are below the 10 in a million threshold (see Section 5.0), they are less than significant.

6.2 Population Cancer Burden

In relation to the 2021 Baseline and the Future Floating Baseline, respectively, the cancer burden is predicted to be 0.18 and 0.42 which are both less than the significance threshold of 0.5. Therefore, the Proposed Project's cancer burden impact would be less than significant. (see Table B3-5).

6.3 Chronic and Acute Hazard Indices

Because chronic and acute hazard indices are based on annual- and peak-hour emissions instead of multiple-year emissions like cancer risk, they are determined by comparing impacts only to the 2021 Baseline.

The maximum chronic hazard index increment is predicted to be less than the significance threshold of 1.0 for all receptor types. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant chronic noncancer impact (see Table B3-5).

The maximum acute hazard index increment is predicted to be less than the significance threshold of 1.0 for all receptor types. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant acute noncancer impact (see Table B3-5).

7.0 Source Contributions

Table B3-6 shows the emission source contributions to cancer risk from the Proposed Project at the residential, non-residential sensitive, and occupational receptor location with the highest predicted cancer risk increments relative to the Floating Future Baseline. Positive contributions reflect increasing emissions over time, while negative contributions reflect decreasing emissions over time. Emissions are modeled in "source groups" according to their common modeling characteristics: equipment type, operation schedule (temporal), and relative location in the modeling domain (spatial). Cancer risks for all three types of receptors are primarily driven by tanker vessel and barge hoteling exhaust during operations at berthing, with the second and third largest contributions from tanker vessels and barge emissions at transit zones and anchorage, respectively. DPM from these sources is the dominant risk driver among all toxic air pollutants.

Table B3-6. Source Contributions to Cancer Risk at the Non-Residential Sensitive, Residential, and Occupational Receptor with Maximum Exposure for the Proposed Project Relative to the Floating Future Baseline

Source Category	Non-Residential Sensitive Receptor		Residential Receptor		Occupational Receptor	
	Risk[a]	% Total Risk	Risk[a]	% Total Risk	Risk[a]	% Total Risk
Operations – Tanker Vessels and Barge Hoteling at Berthing	6.0	86	2.7	84	5.7	95
Operations – Tanker Vessels, Barges, and Harbor Craft at Transit Zones	0.64	9.3	0.28	8.6	0.042	0.70
Operations – Tanker Vessels and Barge Hoteling at Anchorage	0.28	4.0	0.23	7.0	0.027	0.4
Construction – Offroad Equipment	0.0081	0.12	0.0064	0.20	0.098	1.6
Construction and Operations –Trucks	0.00014	0.0020	0.00010	0.0031	0.00027	0.0044
Stationary Sources - Storage Tanks and Fugitive Components	0.017	0.25	0.011	0.33	0.12	2.0
Total[b]	**6.9**	**100**	**3.2**	**100**	**6.0**	**100**

Notes:
[a] Risk represents probability (chances per million) of contracting cancer due to exposure to TAC emissions.
[b] Numbers may not add up due to rounding.

8.0 Risk Uncertainty

Health risk assessments such as the one presented in this appendix are not intended to provide estimates of the absolute health risk or expected incidence of disease in a population but instead are conducted to allow comparisons of the potential health impacts of different alternatives to each other and to significance criteria. Consistent with agency guidelines and standard approaches to regulatory risk assessment, this risk assessment used health-protective (conservative) assumptions to provide a margin of safety with respect to human health. OEHHA has provided a discussion of risk uncertainty, which is reiterated here (OEHHA 2015):

OEHHA has striven to use the best science available in developing these risk assessment guidelines. However, there is a great deal of uncertainty associated with the process of risk assessment. The uncertainty arises from lack of data in many areas necessitating the use of assumptions. The assumptions used in these guidelines are designed to err on the side of health protection in order to avoid underestimation of risk to the public. Sources of uncertainty, which may overestimate or underestimate risk, include: 1) extrapolation of toxicity data in animals to humans, 2) uncertainty in the estimation of emissions, 3) uncertainty in the air dispersion models, and 4) uncertainty in the exposure estimates. In addition to uncertainty, there is a natural range or variability in measured parameters defining the exposure scenario. Scientific studies with representative sampling and large enough sample sizes can characterize this variability. In the specific context of a Hot Spots risk assessment, the source of variability with the greatest quantitative impact is variation among the human population in such properties as height, weight, food consumption, breathing rates, and susceptibility to chemical toxicants. OEHHA captures at least some of the variability in exposure by developing data driven distributions of intake rates, where feasible, in the TSD for Exposure Assessment (OEHHA 2012).

Interactive effects of exposure to more than one carcinogen or toxicant are addressed in the risk assessment with default assumptions of additivity. Cancer risks from all carcinogens addressed in the HRA are added. Similarly, non-cancer hazard quotients for substances impacting the same target organ/system are added to determine the hazard index (HI). Although such effects of multiple chemicals are assumed to be additive by default, several examples of synergism (interactive effects greater than additive) are known. For substances that act synergistically, the HRA could underestimate the risks. Some substances may have antagonistic effects (lessen the toxic effects produced by another substance). For substances that act antagonistically, the HRA could overestimate the risks.

Other sources of uncertainty, which may underestimate or overestimate risk, can be found in exposure estimates where little or no data are available (e.g., soil half-life and dermal penetration of some substances from a soil matrix).

The differences among species and within human populations usually cannot be easily quantified and incorporated into risk assessments. Factors including metabolism, target site sensitivity, diet, immunological responses, and genetics may influence the response to toxicants. The human population is much more diverse both genetically and culturally (e.g., lifestyle, diet) than inbred experimental animals. The intraspecies variability among humans is expected to be much greater than in laboratory animals. In most cases, cancer potency values have been estimated only for the single most affected tumor site. This represents a source of uncertainty in the cancer risk assessment. Adjustment for tumors at multiple sites induced by some carcinogens may result in a higher potency. Some recent assessments of carcinogens include such adjustments. Other uncertainties arise 1) in the assumptions underlying the dose-response model used, and 2) in extrapolating from large experimental doses, where other toxic effects may compromise the assessment of carcinogenic potential, to usually much smaller environmental doses.

When occupational epidemiological data are used to generate a carcinogenic potency or a health protective level for a non-carcinogen, less uncertainty is involved in the extrapolation from workplace exposures to environmental exposures. When using human data, no interspecies extrapolation is necessary, eliminating a significant source of uncertainty. However, children are a subpopulation whose hematological, nervous, endocrine, and immune systems, for example, are still developing and who may be more sensitive to the effects of toxicants on their developing systems. The worker population and risk estimates based on occupational epidemiological data are more uncertain for children than adults. Current risk assessment guidelines include procedures designed to address the possibly greater sensitivity of infants and children, but there are only a few compounds for which these effects have actually been measured experimentally. In most cases, the adjustment relies on default assumptions which may either underestimate or overestimate the true risks faced by infants and children exposed to toxic substances or carcinogens.

Risk estimates generated by an HRA should not be interpreted as the expected rates of disease in the exposed population but rather as estimates of potential for disease, based on current knowledge and a number of assumptions.

In the Hot Spots program, cancer risk is often expressed as the maximum number of new cases of cancer projected to occur in a population of one million people due to exposure to the cancer-causing substance over a 30-year residential period. However, there is uncertainty associated with the cancer risk estimate. An individual's risk of contracting cancer from exposure to facility emissions may be less or more than the risk calculated in

the risk assessment. An individual's risk not only depends on the individual's exposure to a specific chemical but also on his or her genetic background, health, diet, lifestyle choices and other environmental and workplace exposures. OEHHA uses health-protective exposure assumptions to avoid underestimating risk. For example, the risk estimate for airborne exposure to chemical emissions uses the health protective assumption that the individual has a high breathing rate and exposure began early in life when cancer risk is highest.

An REL (or RfD) is the concentration level (or dose level) at or below which no adverse non-cancer health effects are anticipated for the specified exposure duration. RELs are based on the most sensitive, relevant, adverse health effect reported in the medical and toxicological literature. RELs and RfDs are designed to protect the most sensitive individuals in the population by the inclusion of factors that account for uncertainties as well as individual differences in human susceptibility to chemical exposures. The factors used in the calculation of RELs and RfDs are meant to err on the side of public health protection in order to avoid underestimation of non-cancer hazards. An estimated HI higher than the threshold of 1 using the REL or RfD does not automatically indicate an adverse health impact. However, increasing HI above the threshold of 1 increases the likelihood that the adverse non-cancer health effect will occur.

Risk assessments under the Hot Spots program are often used to compare one source with another and to prioritize concerns. Consistent approaches to risk assessment are necessary to fulfill this function.

9.0 References

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 1989. Technical Guidance Document for the Emission Inventory Criteria and Guidelines Regulation for AB 2588. Technical Support Division. August. Available: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2023-07/tgd1989.pdf.

_____. 2023. Speciation Files Used in CARB Modeling. June. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/speciation-profiles-used-carb-modeling

_____. 2022. Hotspots Analysis and Reporting Program, Version 2. Air Dispersion Modeling & Risk Tool (ADMRT), dated 22122. April 28. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/harp-risk-assessment-standalone-tool.

_____. 2023. Consolidated Table of OEHHA/ARB Approved Risk Assessment Health Values. October 6.

LAHD, 2017. Los Angeles Harbor District. Berths 226-237 [Everport] Container Terminal Improvements Project EIS/EIR. April.

OEHHA, 2009. Technical Support Document for Cancer Potency Factors: Methodologies for derivation, listing of available values, and adjustments to allow for early life stage exposures. May. https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/tsdcancerpotency.pdf.

_____2012. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines. Technical Support Document for Exposure Assessment and Stochastic Analysis. August.

_____. 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines. Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. February.

SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 2017. Revisions to the Guideline on Air Quality Models: Enhancements to the AERMOD Dispersion Modeling System and Incorporation of Approaches to Address Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter. 40 CFR Part 51. January 17.

_____2025. AB2588 and Rule 1402 Supplemental Guidelines (Supplemental Guidelines for Preparing Risk Assessments for the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Information and Assessment Act). December. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/risk-assessment/ab-2588-supplemental-guidelines.pdf.

_____. 2023. SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds. March.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2022. AERMOD Modeling System. Support Center for Regulatory Atmospheric Modeling (SCRAM). April 22.

Personal Communication:

SCAQMD, 2005. Personal communication with J. Koizumi. September 21st.