REVISED SECTION 4.4, III. AIR QUALITY: The construction and operation of the MCP Build Alternatives and their design variations would result in significant effects related to air quality if they:

a) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan**
b) **Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation**
c) **Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)**
d) **Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations**
e) **Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people**

The information and analyses in this section are based on the *Air Quality Analysis (March 2012)* and Section 3.14, Air Quality, and the Supplemental Technical Memorandum on Air Quality, Health Risk, and Greenhouse Gas Analyses. Section 3.14 describes the existing air quality in the MCP study area, the potential short- and long-term air quality impacts of the MCP Build Alternatives and their design variations, and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures to address the adverse air quality impacts of the MCP Build Alternatives.

Existing Conditions

As discussed in Section 3.14, historical air quality data show that carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and sulfur dioxide (SO_2) levels in the MCP study area and the general vicinity do not exceed either the state or federal ambient air quality standards (AAQS) for those criteria pollutants. The AAQS for the remaining criteria pollutants (ozone and particulates) are exceeded in the MCP study area. Existing sensitive land uses for air pollutants in the MCP study area include residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, hospitals, and other similar land uses.

The checklist questions listed above were used as the thresholds for assessing whether the MCP Build Alternatives would result in short- and/or long-term adverse direct, indirect, or cumulative air quality impacts for CEQA purposes. In addition, when assessing temporary impacts, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds, although not adopted by RCTC, were considered to allow for comparison of the impacts among the Build Alternatives. The federal ambient air

quality standards for CO and particulate matter (PM) were also considered in this analysis.

No Impact (III.a)

As discussed in Section 3.14, the MCP Build Alternatives would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Both the design concept and the scope of the MCP project are consistent with the project description in the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and the opening year traffic assumptions in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) regional emissions analysis of both the 2012 RTP and the 2013 FTIP. Therefore, the MCP Build Alternatives would not result in impacts related to implementation of any applicable air quality plan. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.

Significant and Unavoidable (III.b)

Short-term Construction Emissions. During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions generated by site preparation, excavation, grading, hauling, and other activities related to construction. Emissions from construction equipment also are anticipated and would include CO, oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), directly-emitted particulate matter (particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size [$PM_{2.5}$] and less than 10 microns in size [PM_{10}]), and toxic air contaminants such as diesel exhaust PM.

The proposed construction schedule for all improvements is approximately 48 months, and construction is anticipated to be completed by 2020. The construction emissions were estimated for the project using the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's (SMAQMD's) Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 7.1.4, a model approved for use within the South Coast Air Basin by the SCAQMD. Construction-related emissions are presented in Table 4.III.A. The construction emissions listed in Table 3.14.W in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS were calculated using Version 6.3.2 of the SMAQMD's Road Construction Emissions Model. Therefore, the emissions listed in Tables 3.14.W and 4.III.A do not match. As shown in Table 4.III.A, the NO_X and PM_{10} emissions during construction would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds. These short-term impacts during construction of the MCP Build Alternatives and their design variations would be adverse and potentially significant. The total PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$

Table 4.III.A Maximum Project Construction Emissions before Mitigation (lbs/day)

Project Phases	ROGs	CO	NO_X	Total PM_{10}	Total $PM_{2.5}$
Grubbing/Land Clearing	16.9	87.8	173.0	157.6	38.0
Grading/Excavation	34.9	172.5	396.9	167.8	46.9
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	16.4	92.5	147.1	157.9	38.3
Paving	8.3	67.9	67.6	3.7	3.3
Maximum (lbs/day)	34.9	172.5	396.9	167.8	46.9
SCAQMD Thresholds (lbs/day)	**75**	**550**	**100**	**150**	**55**

Source: *LSA Associates, Inc.,* January 2014.
CO = carbon monoxide
lbs/day = pounds per day
NO_X = oxides of nitrogen
PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
$PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
ROGs = reactive organic gases
SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

emissions listed in Table 4.III.A include the reductions in fugitive dust provided by the standard SCAQMD construction measures. Implementing Measure AQ-1 would further reduce the fugitive dust emissions. By restricting construction activities and requiring that newer construction equipment be used on site, Measures AQ-2 would reduce the stationary and mobile source emissions to below those listed in Table 4.III.A. Under Measure AQ-2, all off-road construction equipment with a rated horsepower (hp) exceeding 75 would be required to meet or exceed the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Tier 3 off-road diesel engine standards. Because there are no Tier 3 standards, all equipment under 75 hp would be required to meet the Tier 2 standards. Table 4.III.B lists the construction emissions after implementing mitigation measures AQ-1 and AQ-2. At this time it is unknown where electricity from power poles can be used to replace diesel generators or when solar powered message signs can be used. Therefore, the emissions listed in Table 4.III.B do not take credit for these requirements of Mitigation Measure AQ-2. EPA's Tiers 2 and 3 off-road diesel engine standards do not affect the results of the SMAQMD's Road Construction Emissions Model for CO. Therefore, the CO emissions in Tables 4.III.A and 4.III.B are the same. As shown in Table 4.III.B, the construction emissions would continue to exceed the SCAQMD's NO_X and PM_{10}. Therefore, the short-term construction emissions would result in a significant unavoidable impact after mitigation.

Table 4.III.B Maximum Project Construction Emissions after Mitigation (lbs/day)

Project Phases	ROGs	CO	NO_X	Total PM_{10}	Total $PM_{2.5}$
Grubbing/Land Clearing	5.7	87.8	101.8	155.4	36.1
Grading/Excavation	11.9	172.5	259.9	162.3	41.8
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	6.3	92.5	107.4	156.5	37.0
Paving	4.0	67.9	65.0	4.6	4.1
Maximum (lbs/day)	11.9	172.5	259.9	162.3	41.8
SCAQMD Thresholds (lbs/day)	**75**	**550**	**100**	**150**	**55**

Source: *LSA Associates, Inc.,* January 2014.
CO = carbon monoxide
lbs/day = pounds per day
NO_X = oxides of nitrogen
PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
$PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
ROGs = reactive organic gases
SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

Long-term Operational Emissions. As shown in Table 4.III.C, when the project trips are added to the Baseline/Existing (2008) conditions, the regional vehicle emissions would decrease for all of the criteria pollutants. However, as shown in Tables 4.III.D and 4.III.E, when the project trips are added to the 2020 and 2040 No Build conditions, the regional emissions increase for all of the criteria pollutants. The change in the CO, reactive organic gases (ROG), and oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) emissions would exceed the SCAQMD's significance thresholds. ROG and NO_X are precursors to ozone (O_3), a pollutant for which the SCAB is currently in nonattainment for the federal and State standards. Therefore, although the SCAQMD has not set a significance threshold for O_3, the project could result in a substantial O_3 impact. Because RCTC does not have legal authority to control on-road vehicle emissions, there are no mitigation measures by RCTC that can be implemented to reduce the emissions to below the SCAQMD significance thresholds. In addition, the SCAQMD's Regional Clean Air Incentives Program (RECLAIM) is aimed at offsetting emissions generated by new facilities not on-road emissions. Therefore, the project's impact to long-term regional emissions would be significant and unavoidable.

Table 4.III.C 2008 Regional Vehicle Emissions (lbs/day)

Alternative	CO	ROG	NO_X	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	CO_2
No Build	465,705	25,676	143,299	558	6,878	4,641	57,051,890
Alt 4 Mod	442,079	24,468	136,292	530	6,526	4,412	54,185,822
Change from No Build	-23,626	-1,208	-7,007	-27	-351	-229	-2,866,069
Alt 5 Mod	441,100	24,404	136,049	529	6,511	4,401	54,045,450
Change from No Build	-24,605	-1,272	-7,250	-29	-367	-240	-3,006,440
Alt 9 Mod	441,454	24,427	136,165	529	6,516	4,405	54,091,127
Change from No Build	-24,250	-1,249	-7,134	-29	-362	-236	-2,960,763
SCAQMD Significance Thresholds	550	55	55	150	150	55	N/A

Source: Iteris and LSA Associates, Inc., May 2012.
Alt = Alternative
CO = carbon monoxide
CO_2 = carbon dioxide
lbs/day = pounds per day
Mod = Model
NO_X = nitrogen oxides
N/A = Not Applicable
PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
$PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
ROG = reactive organic gases
SO_X = sulfur oxides

Table 4.III.D 2020 Regional Vehicle Emissions (lbs/day)

Alternative	CO	ROG	NO_X	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	CO_2
2008 Existing	465,705	25,676	143,299	558	6,878	4,641	57,051,890
2020 No Build	266,465	14,067	78,654	844	8,675	5634	87,631,280
Alt 4 Mod	266,858	14,107	78,935	846	895	5647	87,885,919
Change from Existing	-198,847	-11,569	-64,364	288	1,818	1006	30,834,029
Change from No Build	393	40	280	2	20	13	254,639
Alt 5 Mod	266,801	14,100	78,905	846	8,692	5645	87,853,255
Change from Existing	-198,904	-11,576	-64,397	288	1,815	1004	30,801,365
Change from No Build	336	34	248	2	17	11	221,975
Alt 9 Mod	266,952	14,115	78,930	847	8,697	5649	87,906,784
Change from Existing	-198,753	-11,561	-64,368	289	1,819	1008	30,854,894
Change from No Build	487	48	276	3	22	15	275,504
SCAQMD Significance Thresholds	**550**	**55**	**55**	**150**	**150**	**55**	**N/A**

Source: Iteris and LSA Associates, Inc., May 2012.
Alt = Alternative
CO = carbon monoxide
CO_2 = carbon dioxide
lbs/day = pounds per day
Mod = Model
NO_X = nitrogen oxides
N/A = Not Applicable
PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
$PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
ROG = reactive organic gases
SO_X = sulfur oxides

Table 4.III.E 2040 Regional Vehicle Emissions (lbs/day)

Alternative	CO	ROG	NO_X	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$	CO_2
2008 Existing	465,705	25,676	143,299	558	6,878	4,641	57,051,890
2040 No Build	201,123	11,003	52,130	1,196	11,582	7,272	125,539,130
Alt 4 Mod	201,720	11,057	52,327	1,200	11,623	7,301	126,057,775
Change from Existing	-263,985	-14,619	-90,972	642	4,746	2,660	69,005,884
Change from No Build	597	54	197	5	42	29	518,645
Alt 5 Mod	201,720	11,056	52,323	1,200	11,623	7,300	126,043,848
Change from Existing	-263,985	-14,620	-90,975	642	4,745	2,659	68,991,958
Change from No Build	598	53	194	4	41	27	504,719
Alt 9 Mod	201,914	11,066	52,365	1,201	11,633	7,306	126,150,645
Change from Existing	-263,790	-14,610	-90,934	643	4,755	2,665	69,098,755
Change from No Build	792	63	235	6	51	34	611,515
SCAQMD Significance Thresholds	**550**	**55**	**55**	**150**	**150**	**55**	**N/A**

Source: Iteris and LSA Associates, Inc., May 2012.
Alt = Alternative
CO = carbon monoxide
CO_2 = carbon dioxide
lbs/day = pounds per day
Mod = Model
NO_X = nitrogen oxides
N/A = Not Applicable
PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
$PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
ROG = reactive organic gases
SO_X = sulfur oxides

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1 **Fugitive Dust Source Controls.** During all site preparation, grading, excavation, and construction, the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) will require the Construction Contractor to:

- Stabilize open storage piles and disturbed areas by covering them and/or applying water or chemical/organic dust palliative to the disturbed surfaces. This applies to inactive and active sites during workdays, weekends, holidays, and windy conditions.
- Install wind fencing, phase grading operations, and operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions.
- Limit vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour (mph) within the project limits.
- Cover loads when hauling material to prevent spillage.
- Limit speed of earthmoving equipment to 10 mph within the project limits.

AQ-2 **Mobile and Stationary Source Controls.** During all site preparation, grading, excavation, and construction, the RCTC Resident Engineer will require the Construction Contractor to:

- Reduce unnecessary idling from heavy equipment by requiring that the construction grading plans include a requirement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use.
- Use solar-powered, instead of diesel-powered, changeable message signs.
- Use electricity from power poles, rather than from generators, when electricity can be acquired from existing power poles in proximity to the construction areas.
- Maintain and tune engines per manufacturers' specifications to perform at United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) certification levels and verified standards applicable to retrofit technologies. The RCTC Resident Engineer will conduct periodic, unscheduled inspections to ensure that there is no unnecessary idling and that construction equipment is properly maintained, tuned, and modified consistent with established specifications.
- Prohibit any tampering with engines and require continuing adherence to manufacturers' recommendations.
- Use new, clean (diesel or retrofitted diesel) equipment meeting the most stringent applicable federal or state standards and commit to the best available emissions control technology. Use Tier 3, or higher, engines for construction equipment with a rated horsepower exceeding 75. Use Tier 2, or higher, engines for construction equipment with a rated horsepower of less than 75. If nonroad construction equipment that meets or exceeds Tier 2 or 3 engine standards is not available, the Construction Contractor will be required to use the best available emissions control technologies on all equipment.
- Use EPA-registered particulate traps and other controls to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter and other pollutants at the construction site.

Evaluation of Potential Alternatives to Reduce or Avoid Significant Unavoidable Adverse Air Quality Impacts of the MCP Build Alternatives

As discussed above, the MCP Build Alternatives would result in significant unavoidable short-term adverse impacts during construction and long-term impacts during project operations. The following alternatives were considered to assess whether they would meet the project objectives and also reduce or avoid the significant unavoidable adverse air quality effects of the MCP Build Alternatives.

No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B. No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B were evaluated in detail in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS. None of the improvements in the MCP Build Alternatives would be constructed under No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B. As a result, No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B would not result in the significant unavoidable short- and long-term air quality impacts that would occur under the MCP Build Alternatives. However, No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B would not meet the defined objectives for the project.

MCP Build Alternatives with a Longer Construction Period. As shown in Table 4.III.B, construction of the MCP Build Alternatives over a 4-year construction period would result in significant unavoidable short-term impacts related to PM_{10} and NOx emissions after mitigation. Those short-term emissions could potentially be reduced to below the SCAQMD thresholds shown in Table 4.III.B if the construction period for the MCP Build Alternatives was extended to be longer than 4 years and focusing on reducing the amount of time specific construction activities generate PM10 and NOx emissions. Because the PM10 emissions during the different construction phases would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds by relatively small amounts as shown in Table 4.III.B, the total construction period would not need to be extended substantially to reduce the daily PM10 emissions to below the SCAQMD thresholds. However, because the SCAQMD NOx threshold would be substantially exceeded during the project grading and excavation (259.9 pounds per day (lbs/day) compared to the SCAQMD threshold of 100 lbs/day) Under this approach, the total amount of construction related emissions would be approximately the same as for the 4-year construction period, but spread over a much longer period of time. Therefore, although there would be a reduction in daily emissions, to below the SCAMD thresholds, with a longer construction period, the total construction related emissions would be the same, the cost of the project would likely increase, there would be no avoidance or reduction in long-term PM_{10} and NO_X emissions during operation of the Build Alternatives, and the longer construction period could result in greater impacts on the surrounding communities including traffic and community disruption.

Less than Significant (III.c and III.d)

The MCP Build Alternatives would help to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion on road links in the project vicinity. The MCP study area is in an attainment area for the state CO standards and an attainment/maintenance area for the federal CO standards. Using the Caltrans Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol (Protocol), a screening level CO hot-spot analysis was conducted

No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B. No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B were evaluated in detail in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS. None of the improvements in the MCP Build Alternatives would be constructed under No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B. As a result, No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B would not result in the significant unavoidable short- and long-term air quality impacts that would occur under the MCP Build Alternatives. However, No Build Alternatives 1A and 1B would not meet the defined objectives for the project.

MCP Build Alternatives with a Longer Construction Period. As shown in Table 4.III.B, construction of the MCP Build Alternatives over a 4-year construction period would result in significant unavoidable short-term impacts related to PM_{10} and NO_x emissions after mitigation. Those short-term emissions could potentially be reduced to below the SCAQMD thresholds shown in Table 4.III.B if the construction period for the MCP Build Alternatives was extended to be longer than 4 years and focusing on reducing the amount of time specific construction activities generate PM_{10} and NO_x emissions. Because the PM_{10} emissions during the different construction phases would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds by relatively small amounts as shown in Table 4.III.B, the total construction period would not need to be extended substantially to reduce the daily PM_{10} emissions to below the SCAQMD thresholds. However, because the SCAQMD NO_x threshold would be substantially exceeded during the project grading and excavation (259.9 pounds per day (lbs/day) compared to the SCAQMD threshold of 100 lbs/day), a longer construction period was evaluated to reduce the daily emissions. Under this approach, the total amount of construction related emissions would be approximately the same as for the 4-year construction period, but spread over a much longer period of time. Therefore, although there would be a reduction in daily emissions, to below the SCAMD thresholds, with a longer construction period, the total construction related emissions would be the same, the cost of the project would likely increase, there would be no avoidance or reduction in long-term PM_{10} and NO_x emissions during operation of the Build Alternatives, and the longer construction period could result in greater impacts on the surrounding communities including traffic and community disruption.

Less than Significant (III.c and III.d)

The MCP Build Alternatives would help to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion on road links in the project vicinity. The MCP study area is in an attainment area for the state CO standards and an attainment/maintenance area for the federal CO standards. Using the Caltrans Transportation Project-Level Carbon

Monoxide Protocol (Protocol), a screening level CO hot-spot analysis was conducted to determine whether the project would result in any exceedances of the CO AAQS. It was determined in Section 3.14 in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS that the MCP Build Alternatives and their design variations would not result in any exceedance of the state or federal 1-hour or 8-hour CO standards. Therefore, the project effects related to CO emissions would be below a level of significance under CEQA. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures would be required.

The Hot Spot analysis ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}) described in Section 3.14, in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, indicates that the MCP Build Alternatives would not contribute to a PM hot spot that would cause or contribute to a violation of the federal PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ standards. Therefore, the potential impacts during operation of the MCP Build Alternatives related to PM emissions would be less than significant under CEQA. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.

The Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) analysis described in Section 3.14, in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, indicates that the 2020 and 2040 MSAT emissions in the study area under the MCP Build Alternatives would be very similar to the MSAT emissions under the No Build Alternatives and much lower than existing conditions, largely due to improvements resulting from stricter EPA engine and fuel regulations. Therefore, the MCP Build Alternatives and their design variations would result in less than significant impacts related to MSAT emissions under CEQA. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.

For pollutants without defined significance standards or air contaminants not covered by the standard criteria cited above, the definition of substantial pollutant concentrations varies. For toxic air contaminants (TAC), "substantial" indicates that the individual cancer risk exceeds a threshold considered to be a prudent risk-management level. If best-available control technology for toxics (T-BACT) has been applied, the individual cancer risk to the maximally exposed individual (MEI) must not exceed 10 in 1 million in order for an impact to be determined not to be significant.

The following limits for maximum individual cancer risk (MICR), cancer burden, and noncancer acute and chronic hazard indices (HI) from project emissions of TACs have been established for the South Coast Air Basin[1]:

[1] http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/signthres.pdf, accessed January 8, 2014.

Table 4.III.F Results of Health Risk Assessment Modeling (Construction)

Distance from Construction Equipment in meters (feet)	Inhalation Cancer Risk No. in 1 Million	Inhalation Chronic Risk Factor
25 (85)	4.34	0.7605
30 (105)	4.27	0.747396
35 (115)	4.2	0.735228
40 (135)	4.06	0.71136
45 (155)	3.88	0.680004
50 (165)	3.7	0.648648
55 (185)	3.5	0.614016
60 (205)	3.37	0.590148
65 (215)	3.2	0.560196
70 (235)	3	0.5265
75 (255)	2.87	0.502164
80 (265)	2.79	0.488124
85 (285)	2.68	0.47034
90 (305)	2.57	0.451105
95 (315)	2.46	0.430888
100 (335)	2.34	0.410436

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., January 2014.

A screening analysis to determine the long-term health risks associated with the on-road operational diesel vehicles on the MCP facility was prepared for the proposed Build Alternatives. This analysis was performed using the SCREEN3 dispersion model, a single source Gaussian plume model which provides maximum ground-level concentrations for point, area, flare, and volume sources. A complete summary of the health risk assessment is included in Section 5.3.2 of the *Air Quality Analysis* (March 2012). The inhalation cancer risk and inhalation chronic risk were calculated using the peak average daily traffic (ADT) volumes for each of the MCP Build Alternatives. The results of the modeling are shown in Table 4.III.G. As shown, for a resident living within 20 meters (65 feet) of the roadway centerline, the cancer risk threshold of 10 in 1 million and the chronic risk threshold of 1 would not be exceeded by any of the MCP Build Alternatives. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any adverse health risks to persons near the project, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Table 4.III.G Results of Health Risk Assessment Modeling (Operations)

Alternative	Peak Volume ADT	Maximum PM_{10} Concentrations		Inhalation Cancer Risk for Adults No. in 1 Million[1]	Inhalation Cancer Risk for Children No. in 1 Million[1]	Inhalation Chronic Risk Factor[1]
		($\mu g/m^3$)	($\mu g/m^3$)			
Existing	24,400	0.0041	0.00033	0.07	0.014	0.00007
No Build	79,000	0.0132	0.00106	0.24	0.046	0.00021
Alt 4 Mod	93,600	0.0252	0.00201	0.46	0.088	0.00040
Alt 5 Mod	93,400	0.0251	0.00201	0.46	0.088	0.00040
Alt 9 Mod	93,800	0.0252	0.00202	0.46	0.088	0.00040

Source: Air Quality Analysis, March 2012.

[1] All health risk levels reported are for individuals living 20 m (65 feet) from the roadway centerline. Any person living further from the roadway centerline would experience lower health risk levels than shown in this table for persons living within 20 m (65 feet) from the roadway centerline.

ADT = average daily traffic
Alt = Alternative
$\mu g/m^3$ = micrograms per cubic meter of air
m = meter
Mod = Modified
PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter

In summary, the construction and operation of the MCP Build Alternatives and their design variations would result in less than significant impacts related to diesel toxics emissions under CEQA. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.

The project site is in Riverside County, which is not among the counties listed as containing serpentine and ultramafic rock. Therefore, the impact from naturally occurring asbestos during construction of the MCP Build Alternatives would be minimal to none and, as a result, would be below a level of significance under CEQA. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.

Less than significant (III.e)

As discussed in Section 3.14 in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, during construction, particularly during asphalt paving and the operation of diesel equipment, short-term odors would be generated in the immediate vicinity of those activities. These odors would dissipate quickly, to below detectable levels, as the distance from the odor-generating activities increases. Because these odors would be short-term, limited to only certain activities, and would dissipate quickly, this would be a less than significant impact under CEQA during construction of the MCP Build Alternatives and their design variations. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.