
APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETINGS



KOMEX • H2O SCIENCE • INC
11040 SANTA MONICA BLVD., SUITE 300
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025, USA
TEL 310.914.5901 FAX 310.914.5959
EMAIL: info@losangeles.komex.com
WEB SITE: www.komex.com

ENVIRONMENT AND WATER RESOURCES

MEETING SUMMARIES FOR COMMUNITY MEETINGS HELD JULY 29TH, JULY 31ST, AND AUGUST 5, 2003

PREPARED BY:

KOMEX

11040 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 300

Los Angeles, CA 90025

USA

Date: September 9, 2003

Project Number: 296-001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	2
2	JULY 29, 2003 MEETING	3
3	JULY 31, 2003 MEETING	10
4	AUGUST 5, 2003 MEETING	12
5	CLOSURE/LIMITATIONS.....	24

1 INTRODUCTION

Three public meetings have been held to date to gather information from the communities living within ½ mile of three Omnitrans fueling stations. The three stations are located at 1700 West 5th Street, San Bernardino, 234 South I Street, San Bernardino, and 4748 Arrow Highway, Montclair, California. The stations located on West 5th Street (San Bernardino) and Arrow Highway (Montclair) dispense liquid to compressed natural gas (LCNG) and diesel fuel to buses using the facility. Unleaded gas is also dispensed to staff cars, vans and trucks. The station located on South I Street dispenses unleaded gasoline to buses using the facility.

Advertisements were run in local papers (Daily Bulletin, The Sun, and El Chicano) prior to the meetings. In flyers sent to residents located within ½ mile of each facility (total of 3,000) community meetings were advertised as an opportunity for “community members ... to meet Komex H2O Science staff and voice any concerns about the fueling facilities. Community input gathered at these meetings will be used to help determine the nature and extent of research prior to implementation.” Flyers in English and Spanish were sent to all residences located within a ½ mile radius of each facility. Flyers were also sent to local newspapers in the form of a media alert. The flyers notified residents that interested community members were invited to participate in public meetings regarding the potential environmental and public health impacts of Omnitrans bus fueling stations. The flyer further described that this effort was part of a study being conducted by project consultant Komex H2O Science, in compliance with Senate Bill 1927.

2 JULY 29, 2003 MEETING

The first meeting to update the community on the proposed project was held from 6:00 PM to 8:15 PM on July 29, 2003 at the Paul Villansenor Branch Library (525 North Mt. Vernon, San Bernardino). The meeting was hosted by James Clark of Komex, the principal investigator. Luis Castro from Komex was present to provide translation services to Spanish-speaking community members. Information provided by Komex to community members included a summary package that outlined the status of the study; the proposed scope and goals of the study; information received to date from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), Omnitrans, and others; the definition of the study areas; the scheduling of the community meetings; a tentative timeline for the project; the proposed final work product; Dr. Clark's resume; and a mailing coupon for interested community members to supply questions or comments on the study to the principal investigator. In addition, copies of Komex's Statement of Qualifications and various brochures detailing Komex's capabilities, as well as poster size photographs of each study area, were available.

Komex did not have a sign-in sheet, a microphone for speakers, or wireless headsets for simultaneous translation at this meeting. Approximately 50 community members were present along with one representative of Omnitrans, Ms. Wendy Williams.

The meeting started with an introductory statement from Dr. Clark, the introduction of Mr. Castro and the offer to provide translation services, a review of the materials in the summary packets, and a description of how to contact Komex.

Questions and comments from the community members present at the meeting included:

- 1 A representative from the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice [CCA EJ] and Westside Residents for Cleaner Air Now (WRCAN), Ms. Jan Misqueza, asked why the principal investigator was proposing to survey more than the Omnitrans fueling stations. She further stated that the proposed scope of work from the principal investigator was not what Senate Bill 1927 (SB 1927) was supposed to address and that the intent of SB 1927 was to have an environmental impact report of each of the Omnitrans fueling stations.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

- 2 Another representative from WRCAN asked whether The principal investigator was prepared to have a community representative accompany the surveyors.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator agreed that would be an appropriate step.

-
- 3 Ms. Misquez asked whether the meeting was being recorded or documented.
RESPONSE: Dr. Clark pointed out that notes were being taken and agreed to the suggestion that a tape recorder should be brought to all future meetings.
- 4 Were community members invited to the meetings?
RESPONSE: The principal investigator pointed out that residents within a ½ mile radius of each facility had been sent flyers in English and Spanish inviting them to attend any of the three scheduled meetings.
- 5 Was the principal investigator aware that the history between the community and Omnitrans went back as far as 1995? Was the principal investigator aware that promises made by Omnitrans, such as not expanding into the neighborhood and not using chemicals at the site, had been broken?
RESPONSE: The principal investigator is reviewing all available information regarding the history of the site but is tasked with measuring the public health and environmental impacts as detailed in its proposal to Omnitrans’s RFP.
- 6 A speaker pointed out that there was no “historical memory” at Omnitrans and that in the speakers opinion, nothing had changed or improved.
RESPONSE: Comment noted.
- 7 The principal investigator was cautioned to not be reactive but rather to take a proactive stance in this investigation.
RESPONSE: Comment noted.
- 8 A representative from the San Bernardino School , Ms. Teresa Parra,, asked how the school was receiving information regarding the Omnitrans facility located at 1700 West 5th Street.
RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that he was not aware of how the school was receiving information and that he would investigate the process.
- 9 A community member detailed his concerns about emissions from the Omnitrans Facilities. The community member held up a picture of his pet dog that he had been forced to euthanize due to dog’s “unusual cancers”. The community member had taken his dog to the San Bernardino Branch of the State of California’s Animal Health and Food Safety Laboratory System located at 105 Central Avenue, San Bernardino, California. According to the community member the pathology report from the dog did not reveal the specific cause of the cancers. The community member further detailed how he has observed dead birds in the community and that he felt this was analogous to

canaries in a coalmine. He felt that the emissions from the facility, which he described as the “strong smell of garlic”, were the cause of the birds deaths.

RESPONSE: In a follow-up call to the San Bernardino Branch of the State of California’s Animal Health and Food Safety Laboratory System the veterinarian on duty stated that the details of each case are private unless written permission is provided by the animals owner. Furthermore, the veterinarian stated that the only information that could be provided would be a copy of the pathology report, which had been previously provided to the animal’s owner.

- 10 A member of WRCAN asked if the principal investigator would be willing to interview children from Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that it would seek the legal advice on this matter and that if there were no legal or ethical constraints would consider interviewing the students. The principal investigator stated that they would have an answer to the question by the August 5, 2003 meeting.

- 11 A member of WRCAN asked if the principal investigator would be willing to interview staff from Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that it would consider interviewing the staff and would contact the school’s Principal Mr. Jack Oates.

- 12 Would The principal investigator be willing to use Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School as a site for a future meeting?

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that they would check to see if that was a possibility.

- 13 Ms. Jan Misquez restated her position that SB1927 was intended to fund an Environmental Impact Report of the facilities and that the scope of work proposed by The principal investigator did not meet the requirements of the bill. She further stated that the residents are still feeling the effects of past exposures to emission from the West 5th Street facility.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

- 14 A community member asked how long Omnitrans personnel have been involved in the project. Ms. Williams stated that she had been with Omnitrans for the last ten years and had been actively involved in issues surrounding emissions from the facility from the beginning.

- 15 A community member asked since the principal investigator was a third party how come previous issues had not been addressed?

RESPONSE: Komex has been retained to evaluate the potential public health and environmental impacts of emissions from the Omnitrans facilities as per Senate Bill 1927. Komex cannot comment on issues outside that scope of work.

- 16 A community member stated that they did not need a professional opinion to know that their health effects were due to emissions from the Omnitrans facilities.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

- 17 A community member asked who Komex's clients were.

RESPONSE: Komex stated that its clients included school districts, municipalities, and parties with environmental problems.

- 18 Community members asked who was paying for the study and what was the time frame for completion of the study. .

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that Omnitrans is paying for the study, per the requirements of SB 1927, and reviewed the schedule provided in the summary packets.

- 19 A community member stated that students at Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School have developed rashes and that once the student transfers from the school or no longer attends the school the rashes disappear.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

- 20 A community member stated that they were aware of friends whose children were transferred out of Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School and no longer had health issues.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

- 21 Another speaker pointed out that they were aware of several parents who had removed their children from Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School and placed them in other schools in the District.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

- 22 A community member asked whether doctor's papers would be necessary.

RESPONSE: The intent of the public health study is to measure the symptoms and perceived effects within the community. No doctor's confirmed diagnosis is necessary at this time.

- 23 A speaker asked why children were still playing on the fields at Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School.

RESPONSE: A speaker noted that there were “housing issues” at the school and that children needed to use the fields from time to time.

- 24 A speaker asked whether the air in the community could be considered clean since Omnitrans is the largest liquid natural gas fueling station in the world. The speaker further noted that they could not hear alarms from the facility and that the facility was a source of a great deal of noise.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

- 25 A community member stated that they hear “explosions” after midnight coming from the Omnitrans facility. The “explosion” is normally followed by a hissing sound.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

- 26 A community member asked what the conclusions of the report would be. The speaker also pointed out that there were a large number of flies in their backyard, which they attributed to the presence of the Omnitrans facility.

RESPONSE: The conclusions of the report cannot be predicted prior to performing the study. The presence of the flies is noted and will be included as a portion of the environmental study.

- 27 A speaker asked whether the survey of other businesses in the ½ mile radius of the Omnitrans facilities would dilute Omnitrans’ responsibility.

RESPONSE: The intent of the study is to determine the public health and environmental impacts of all emission sources near the facility. This holistic approach will not dilute Omnitrans’ responsibility but will provide the community with a complete picture of the emission sources potential affecting the community.

- 28 A community member asked when the community would receive the report. Prior to Omnitrans receiving the report or after Omnitrans received the report.

RESPONSE: All stakeholders will receive the report at the same time.

- 29 A speaker pointed out that the City of San Bernardino will not let you open a bar without permission but they allowed Omnitrans to open their facilities. The speaker further pointed out that Omnitrans was given an unconditional use permit back in the 1970’s.

RESPONSE: Comment noted. According to Omnitrans prior to installation of natural gas fueling equipment at the 5th St. site, Omnitrans met the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) which included a neighborhood notification by mail.

30 A speaker stated that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) were permitting Omnitrans to release low levels of pollutants.

RESPONSE: The speaker is correct that Omnitrans is a permitted facility under EPA and SCAQMD oversight.

31 A speaker stated that the community feels scarred by Omnitrans.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

32 A community member asked whether the principal investigator would be willing to be in the community late at night (02:00) to survey what they live with.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that it could survey late at night.

33 Jan Misquez (from CCAEJ and WRCAN) stated that this study was the first step in getting Omnitrans out of the community.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

34 A speaker asked whether the bid process was open and how many bids had been received.

RESPONSE: Ms. Williams (from Omnitrans) stated that the process was open and that two bids had been received.

35 Jan Misquez (from CCAEJ and WRCAN) stated that they had only 2 days to respond to the bid process and they therefore declined to participate in the selection of the consultant for the study.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

36 A speaker asked if Omnitrans would be aware of when the sampling would be performed.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that the time, duration, and manner of the sampling had yet to be determined so it could not be stated whether Omnitrans would be notified prior to the sampling.

37 A community member that has worked at the local rail yard for the last 26 years stated that when he lived near the school for 2 years he was subject to dizzy spells, nausea, and nose bleeds. The speaker stated that early one morning he witnessed green vapors in the street. After moving closer to the rail yard his health problems resolved.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

38 A speaker noted that there were no health problems in the community until Omnitrans moved to the neighborhood.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

39 A speaker asked what are the parameters of the site(s).

RESPONSE: The study will attempt to measure emissions from all businesses (including the Omnitrans facilities) within a ½ mile radius of each Omnitrans facility to determine the pollutants in the communities. In addition, the health survey will attempt to measure the symptoms and health effects reported by the community. The study will further attempt to determine if there is a relationship between the emissions and the self-reported health effects.

40 A community member asked why Omnitrans continues to use LNG.

RESPONSE: According to records from Omnitrans reviewed by the principal investigator, under federal and state clean air requirements Omnitrans is encouraged/mandated to use alternative fuels to reduce criteria pollutant emissions. According to the SCAQMD, *criteria air pollutants* that are known to cause human health impacts due to their release from numerous sources. The criteria pollutants include: ozone (O₃), particulate matter (PM₁₀), carbon monoxide (CO), lead (Pb), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂). Emissions from stationary and mobile sources (primarily older model gasoline burning and diesel vehicles) are known to emit or contribute to the formation of criteria pollutants. SCAQMD Rule 2202 requires transit agencies to purchase natural gas powered vehicles.

41 A speaker noted that they had observed people walking behind an Omnitrans bus in full chemical suits approximately 2 years ago. The bus exited the facility and proceeded down Tijuana Avenue.

RESPONSE: Comment noted. The principal investigator is trying to determine whether the scenario described above was part of the previous investigations performed at the site. A representative from Omnitrans stated that Omnitrans has no knowledge of this event.

42 A community member noted that they hear the pressure relief valve(s) at the Omnitrans facility releasing gas in the afternoon and at night.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

43 A speaker asked whether Omnitrans is fueling buses for other transit groups from Victor Valley. The speaker also asked whether Omnitrans is buying homes in the area immediately around the West 5th Street facility. Lastly, the speaker stated that there were a number of traffic issues related to having buses running through the neighborhood.

RESPONSE: Comments noted. Omnitrans fuels 3 CNG buses from VVTA on weekdays.

44 A speaker stated that a bus had scrapped a turn on 7th Street.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

45 A speaker asked whether the principal investigator would take a member of WRAN or CCAEJ with them when the health survey was performed.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator had previously agreed that taking a member of WRAN or CCAEJ would be advisable.

46 A speaker summarized the major points/questions of the meeting:

- Would a list of survey questions to the community and business be available for review?
- Would the survey be available for review?
- Would former students of the Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School be interviewed? The speaker asked whether students who do not live in the ½ mile radius of the school would be interviewed.
- Would a microphone and tape recorder be brought to future meetings?
- Will the staff and principal of the Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School be interviewed.
- Will flyers be sent to parents of students at Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School regarding the study.
- Will flyers for parents of students at Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School be translated to Spanish.
- Will former students of Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School be interviewed if the parents permission can be obtained.
- Will Spanish translations of materials be available at future meetings.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

3 JULY 31, 2003 MEETING

The second meeting to update the community on the proposed project was held from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM on July 31, 2003 at Montclair's City Hall in the **Council** Chambers (5111 Benito Street, Montclair). The meeting was hosted by James Clark of Komex, the principal investigator. Luis Castro from Komex was present to provide translation services to Spanish-speaking community members. Information provided by Komex to community members included a summary package (in English and Spanish) that outlined the status of the study; the proposed scope and goals of the study; information received to date from the SCAQMD, Omnitrans, and others; the definition of the study areas; the scheduling of the community meetings; a tentative timeline for the project; the proposed final work product; Dr. Clark's resume; a mailing coupon for interested community members to supply questions or comments on the study to the principal investigator; and a copy of Senate Bill 1927. In addition, copies of Komex's Statement of Qualifications (in English and Spanish) and various brochures detailing Komex's capabilities, as well as poster size photographs of each study area, were available.

Only three community members (Marilyn Alcantar, Teresa Lopez, and Louise Morana of WRAN) were present along with one representative of Omnitrans, Mr. Durand Rall.

No formal presentation was given since the three community members had been present at the last meeting. Audio tape recording equipment and Spanish translation equipment available at the time of the meeting.

4 AUGUST 5, 2003 MEETING

The third meeting to update the community on the proposed project was held from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM on August 5, 2003 at the Paul Villansenor Branch Library (525 North Mt. Vernon, San Bernardino). The meeting was hosted by James Clark of Komex, the principal investigator. Luis Castro from Komex was present to provide translation services to Spanish-speaking community members. Information provided by Komex to community members included a summary package (in English and Spanish) that outlined the status of the study; the proposed scope and goals of the study; information received to date from the SCAQMD, Omnitrans, and others; the definition of the study areas; the scheduling of the community meetings; a tentative timeline for the project; the proposed final work product; Dr. Clark's resume; a mailing coupon for interested community members to supply questions or comments on the study to the principal investigator; and a copy of Senate Bill 1927. In addition, copies of Komex's Statement of Qualifications (in English and Spanish) and various brochures detailing Komex's capabilities, as well as poster size photographs of each study area, were available.

Approximately 25 community members were present along with one representative of Omnitrans, Ms. Wendy Williams. The meeting was tape recorded by Komex and videotaped by a representative of WRAN. Representatives from the San Bernardino City Council office (sorry no name), Congressman Baca's office (Jesse Valenzuela), Assemblymember Longville (Eldred Marshall), and Senator Soto's office (Francis Vasquez) were present in the room.

The meeting started with an introductory statement from Dr. Clark, the introduction of Mr. Castro and the offer to provide translation services, and a request from Dr. Clark for the representatives of elected officials to address the community members present at the meeting. Representatives of elected officials were given an opportunity to address the community members.

The first representative (from Senator Soto's office, Ms. Francis Vasquez) stated that the process was being followed by the officials and that the study process itself was a very good thing. The representative from Congressman Baca's office stated that the Congressman was following what had been going on with a great deal of interest. The other representatives declined to speak initially.

Before the formal presentation, the principal investigator read the contents of Senate Bill 1927 which states in Section 99165 (a) For the purposes of this section, "environmental and public health impacts" means those impacts that affect the health and environment of persons living,

working, and attending school in the vicinity of a bus fueling station, including but not limited to, impacts associated with nuisance odors.

Section 99165 (b) that on or before July 1, 2003, the Omnitrans Joint Powers Authority shall contract with an independent third party to prepare and submit to the Legislature and Governor a report on the environmental and public health impacts of transit bus fueling stations located within the jurisdiction of the authority and owned or operated by the authority. In conducting the assessment, the authority shall hold at least one noticed public hearing in the vicinity of each bus fueling station for the purposes of soliciting input from persons who may be affected by those impacts.

The principal investigator noted that this was the third meeting, and that the first meeting was very well attended while the second meeting was attended well by the Westside Residents only.

Komex asked that community members not present at previous meetings be allowed to speak first. Questions were asked for and none given.

Komex reviewed the outstanding issues from the last meetings.

- 1 A microphone was in place and a tape recorder was present to record the nights meeting. Notes from all three meetings were to be prepared and submitted back to the stakeholders to ensure comments/concerns were being addressed.
- 2 Translation services were being provided by Komex through 20 wireless headsets. No community members availed themselves of the headsets during the meeting.
- 3 The potential for interviewing past and present students was addressed. Komex had contacted internal and external counsel, as well as the San Bernardino District Attorney (DA) responsible for Juvenile Affairs, to get a legal opinion on interviewing students. The information received from internal and external counsel is that if interviews are conducted with the permission of the parents and the parents are present, it is appropriate. Advice from counsel included getting agreement from the DA since they deal with matter related to minors most frequently. Komex is still waiting for a response from the DA. If the DA agrees and they can provide the questioning format that is appropriate, the study will try to include interviews of past and present students.
- 4 Coordination with the San Bernardino School District needs to be done prior to the scheduling of any meeting at the school and the potential interviewing of students.
- 5 In regards to the ecological effects noted in the first meeting, specifically the ill dog and dead birds in the community, several attempts were made to contact the San Bernardino Branch of the State of California's Animal Health and Food Safety Laboratory System. A

veterinarian on duty stated that the details of each case are private unless written permission is provided by the animals owner. Furthermore, the veterinarian stated that the only information that could be provided would be a copy of the pathology report, which had been previously provided to the animal's owner.

- 6 The last item prior to the open discussion was the odor complaint logged against Omnitrans on August 1, 2003. On August 1, 2003 at approximately 2:15 PM, Marilyn Alcantar called to inform Komex that a gas leak had occurred at the Omnitrans facility at approximately 11:30 AM and lasted for approximately 15 or 20 minutes. The SCAQMD had been present at the school site and according to Ms. Alcantar, the SCAQMD inspector determined that the source of the odor was sludge at the facility since the odor appeared to be hydrogen sulfide. According to Ms. Alcantar, parents present at the school during this time reported that the odor smelled like natural gas. Additionally, another inspector from SCAQMD informed Ms. Alcantar that SCAQMD had been notified that work was proceeding at the 5th Street Station. She inquired as to why the School had not been notified. Additionally, Ms. Alcantar stated that the testing equipment at the School did not function and that the school personnel had to review the operations manual before they could determine how the equipment functioned.

According to Omnitrans, the August 1, 2003 odor complaint was caused by the quarterly (once every three months) pump out of clarifier tanks at the West 5th Street facility. The clarifiers collect wastewater and run-off from Omnitrans' bus wash, fuel island and bus yard. Omnitrans is required by EPA to capture the wastewater. The wastewater has an odor similar to sewer gas. To control the odor, Omnitrans puts enzymes in the tanks weekly to minimize odor build up.

According to Omnitrans, on August 1, 2003 a vendor arrived at 5 a.m. to pump out the clarifier tanks. As per procedure, SCAQMD was notified of the pump out prior to the vendor arriving onsite. This task is typically completed prior to 7 AM., however on August 1, 2003, the vendor was unable to complete the task with the 2 trucks sent that day. They had to leave, dump one truck and return to complete the task at approximately 11:30 AM.

Since SCAQMD had been notified of the pump-out, SCAQMD Inspector Frederico Graglia was on-site on August 1, 2003. According to Omnitrans, at the time of the pump-out, no odor was detected more than a few feet away from the storage tanks. After a complaint call later in the day, the inspector returned to Omnitrans and again did not detect an odor beyond a few feet from the tanks.

Additionally, SCAQMD chemist R. Dominguez was at the monitoring station located at Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School. Mr. Dominguez noted that he detected an odor, which he described as not smelling like natural gas or methyl mercaptan, at approximately 11:50 AM. He was unable to collect an air sample at that time because the equipment did not work.

The inspector advised Omnitrans to contact the school about the odor complaint. This was done by Omnitrans Maintenance staff. Omnitrans did not contact the school in advance because it was originally anticipated that the task would be complete prior to school hours. Omnitrans agreed that they should have contacted them prior to the vendor returning at 11:30 to complete the task.

On August 5, 2003, SCAQMD staff members Graglia and Dominguez returned to the West 5th Street station to further inspect and collect air samples from the clarifier holding tanks. Inspector Graglia indicated that of the odor complaints received by SCAQMD, all but one described the odor as natural gas. Another person said that they had detected two separate odors: one described as natural gas and the other described as something dead. This second odor appeared to last only a very short time. Mr. Dominguez stated that the odor he detected on August 1, 2003 was the same odor he could detect from the open clarifier. A grab sample of air from inside the clarifier holding tanks measured hydrogen sulfide at a concentration of approximately 39 parts per billion (ppb). The odor threshold, or the lowest concentration at which hydrogen sulfide is normally detected, is approximately 8 to 10 ppb.

Questions and comments from the community members present at the meeting included:

- 1 A representative from the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice [CCA EJ] and Westside Residents for Cleaner Air Now (WRCAN), Ms. Jan Misqueu, asked **if** the clarifier system is tested prior to the clean-outs/pump-outs.

RESPONSE: According to Omnitrans, the pumping of waste water is not regulated by the SCAQMD with the exception of any odors that might be generated as a result of the pumping operation. The EPA (Federal and California Agencies) require that all materials deposited into a waste water outflow be tested or characterized by type and hazard to ensure proper handling, disposal and regulatory compliance with local, state, and federal waste water regulations.

The chemicals and other substances that enter the clarifier are identified on the Agency's Business and Emergency Contingency Plan on file with the County Fire Department HAZMAT Division, it is a matter of record as to what Omnitrans is placing into the

clarifier (sewer) system. The clarifier waste stream is sampled on a scheduled basis by the City of San Bernardino Water Department and copies of the sampling are on file with that Department. Omnitrans' contractor conducts waste stream sampling as necessary in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. The Agency's Hazardous Materials Disposal Service has a baseline sample of all waste streams requiring sampling and periodically updates this baseline to validate compliance with hazardous waste regulations. Sampling is also conducted when ever new chemicals or substances are deposited into the clarifier system. At the present time the waste water within the clarifiers and subsequently being deposited into the industrial sewer system is classified as a non-hazardous waste product.

- 2 A representative from WeCAN, Ms. Marilyn Alcantar, provided copies of three different e-mails from Bob Rodemeyer of Omnitrans to the staff at the Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School (from the year 1999 and 2000) that discussed among other things the quarterly clarifier pump-outs. Ms. Alcantar read several excerpts including "This clean out operation has resulted in occasional discharges of odor (sewer gas) similar to the smell of natural gas odorants. I have requested that this operation be performed as early or late as possible so as not to be performed during the schools lunch period. This precaution should help prevent any unplanned or accidental discharge of odor during the lunch hour" (January 7, 2000 e-mail); "The contractor was reminded of our agreement to notify neighbor's prior to performing such activities in the future" (November 19, 1999 e-mail);

RESPONSE: Comment noted. This information will be included in the history section of the report.

- 3 Ms. Misquez asked whether there would be more public meetings.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator commented at the time of the meeting that it would try to find a way within the budget constraints to have more meetings because they are valuable. The community's input is extremely valuable to the report process.

- 4 Ms. Misquez felt that the Spanish-speaking members of the community had been discouraged by the last meeting and were not attending the current meeting.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator apologized for the perception and encouraged the community members present to share all of the information with those community members who were not present.

- 5 A community member asked whether Komex would be performing any air sampling in the near future.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that no testing was currently being performed. The schedule of the study was reviewed with the community members present to detail the steps and the goals of study.

- 6 A community member asked whether the health survey was to be limited to residents within a ½ mile radius of each of the facilities.

RESPONSE: The survey will be limited to residents within a ½ mile radius of each site. The analysis of the survey will include a breakdown of the demographics of the community (distance from site, age, gender, etc...) that will be useful in defining relations between exposure and reported symptoms.

- 7 A speaker asked whether a lung testing or blood sampling would be performed.

RESPONSE: No physiological sampling will be performed in this study.

- 8 A representative from WRAN inquired why physiological sampling was not being performed since this was a health survey and couldn't the scope of work be modified to include that type of sampling in lieu of the emission inventory of local businesses. Why couldn't a physician be brought in to perform those tests?

RESPONSE: The proposed study by Komex was designed to fulfill the scope of work outlined in Omnitrans' Request For Proposal ADMN03-1 released on February 4, 2003.

- 9 A speaker asked since the most frequently raised issue related to breathing difficulty of children, would children at the school or in the community be interviewed on their breathing problems and what type of information is expected.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that he did not want to pre-determine the types of information that would come out of interviews or the results of the study.

- 10 A representative of WRAN asked whether there had been studies to determine what the health effects of long-term exposure to natural gas on children.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that most studies on exposure to natural gas or methane have focused on workplace exposures to high concentrations of gas. A review of available literature from databases served by the National Library of Medicine (NLM) revealed only one study of a community exposed to sour gas (natural gas containing hydrogen sulfide) in Canada (Sptizer, WO et al., (1989). Chronic Exposure to Sour Gas Emissions: Meeting a Community Concern with Epidemiologic Evidence. Canadian Medical Association Journal, Vol. 141(7): 685-691) . According to the study abstract "An excess in the number of symptoms and health problems was reported by those living currently in the area, but no significant differences were observed in

mortality rate, incidence of cancer, reproductive problems, major ailments, hair levels of arsenic (7440382) or other metals, or respiratory function.”

- 11 A representative of WRAN asked how the study would be able to attribute specific symptoms within the study area with exposure to emissions from the Omnitrans facility.

RESPONSE: Symptoms and health effects reported by community residents will be grouped into blocks representing discrete areas within each study area. A statistical analysis will be performed to determine relationship of the types of symptoms and health effects reported with the distance from the fueling station.

- 12 A speaker asked whether the principal investigator performed environmental impact studies.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that he specializes in toxicology and health risk assessments not environmental impact reports.

- 13 A speaker asked whether the principal investigator had performed this type of study before.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator stated that he had been part of a large regional study of health effects from air pollutants as well as assessments of schools that had been built near or over oil wells.

- 14 A speaker asked whether Komex had obtained school written, nursing logs to evaluate symptoms.

RESPONSE: Copies of school nursing logs have been provided by the stakeholders (Omnitrans and CCAEJ) that do not have personal information. The types of symptoms reported by children are noted along with the date.

- 15 A speaker asked were the source data was coming from. The speaker requested that data school nurse log data be collected from other schools in the district and a comparison of symptoms reported be performed.

RESPONSE: Data is being provided by the stakeholders including studies performed for Omnitrans, complaint logs from SCAQMD, school nurse logs, and other information from WRAN. The primary source of data will be the responses from the community survey.

- 16 A speaker asked if the study was going to include students that live outside the ½ mile radius. The speaker noted that many of the students are bused in and the potential health impacts on this group could be missed without the participation of the school district.

RESPONSE: The study will attempt to work with the school and school district to get as much of that information as possible.

17 A speaker asked what school safety policy was regarding Omnitrans.

RESPONSE: Komex will attempt to document what the procedure is for the school by working with the school and school district. A representative from WRAN pointed out that there had been no policy in place at the school and that they helped develop one to prevent the children from being exposed.

18 A speaker noted that their child used to attend Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School and had a number of health problems (breathing problems). After their child left the school the problems resolved and when the child goes back to the area near the school he becomes ill. The child is no longer allowed near the school or the Omnitrans facility. The speaker stated that what Omnitrans was doing was abuse.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

19 A speaker pointed out that the Omnitrans facility on West 5th Street is in a residential neighborhood while the other facilities are in industrial areas. The facility is across from a school and they hoped that the outcome of the study had not already been determined.

RESPONSE: Comment noted. No outcomes or conclusions have been made or will be made until the end of the study.

20 A speaker asked whether SCAQMD had a role in the study.

RESPONSE: SCAQMD is supplying information but Omnitrans is paying for the study as outlined in SB 1927. SCAQMD also participated in vendor selection/evaluation.

21 A speaker asked if Omnitrans would get the report first since they are paying for it.

RESPONSE: The report will be provided to all stakeholders (CCA EJ and Omnitrans) at the same time.

22 A speaker asked how the study came to be.

RESPONSE: A representative from WRAN stated that Omnitrans should have done an EIR prior to construction of the West 5th Street. SB 1927 stated that Omnitrans would have to pay for the study out of already existing funds. According to the WRAN representative, Omnitrans got the money from SANBAG.

23 A speaker stated that they did not trust Omnitrans to fix the problems and wanted the “60,000 gallon bomb” out of there. According to the speaker, Mr. Rall admitted that toxic gas was being emitted from the facility. In addition, the speaker noted that in the past three years the principals at Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School were lemons and did nothing to protect the children at the school. According to the speaker, the

current principal did not know how to use the monitoring instrument and had to rely on the room aid to try to work it. The speaker suggested that the principal should be able to use the monitoring equipment and should be able to provide instruction to the staff on how to work it.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

- 24 A community member related how their children go to Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School and that all three their children have asthma even though they did not. The speaker stated that this was the first time that they were aware that there was a problem with Omnitrans. The speaker stated that Omnitrans should do something about the problem for the children.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator pointed out that they were not a representative of Omnitrans and that Komex was retained to evaluate the issues related to pollutants in the area.

- 25 A speaker asked what could be expected if a person were to sit down everyday and breath the gas potentially being emitted by Omnitrans.

RESPONSE: For short-term acute (high concentration) exposures in a confined space, an exposed individual is likely to pass out due to the displacement of oxygen. What is of more concern is low exposures. Large exposures are typically harmful. The question becomes what is the lowest dose or concentration that someone can be exposed to without harm. Much of the science of toxicology focuses on determining that lowest concentration.

- 26 A speaker asked given by the earlier speaker what advice could be given to community members regarding their health.

RESPONSE: Seek medical care for your family and to provide your physician with as much information as possible to work with. To keep informed with the community and to follow the study since it is an open process.

- 27 A speaker asked whether the study would consider bringing a bus to a central area much like a fair, where people could come to the investigators rather than having a stranger walking through the neighborhood. Another speaker asked whether blood is drawn from a target group and levels of toxins are higher in one group over another, that is a true test.

RESPONSE: The suggestions are noted and beyond the scope of work agreed to at Senator Soto's office.

28 A speaker asked whether there is a predetermined outcome for the study based upon acceptable levels of pollutants for the community.

RESPONSE: No outcome has been determined for the study.

29 A speaker commented that the answers given by the principal investigator are evasive and bureaucratic and meant to protect Omnitrans. The speaker felt that what was happening was environmental terrorism.

RESPONSE: Comment noted. Komex is an independent contractor hired to perform the study and does not represent Omnitrans.

30 A speaker asked whether the survey will go to every door in the neighborhood and will every parent at the school be informed

RESPONSE: Every residence in the neighborhood within ½ mile of each facility will be surveyed and attempts will be made to include day students in the study.

31 A speaker asked how far back the study would review school nursing logs.

RESPONSE: Komex will attempt to obtain records back as far as possible (including records prior to the construction of the Omnitrans facility).

32 A speaker noted that every time a truck comes to perform a pump-out of the clarifier, should the neighborhood expect this type of leak every quarter. According to the speaker, no one had informed the school even though agreements in the past stated that they would do so and that Omnitrans was not being a good neighbor. The speaker further stated that one employee of the school was sent home (she is pregnant) after the incident on August 1, 2003 and that Omnitrans needed to be responsible.

RESPONSE: Comment noted. The representative from Komex restated that they cannot and will not speak for Omnitrans. The information provided by the community will be included in the report. The representative from Komex stated that they could not speak to the issue of notification. A representative from Omnitrans was present and question related to communication needed to be addressed by Omnitrans' representative.

33 A speaker related how they had grown up in the neighborhood near Ramona-Alessandro Elementary School and that her family had attended the school. The speaker stated that she felt a strong attachment to the school.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

34 A speaker from WRAN noted that prior to the use of natural gas there were no complaints from the neighborhood or school related to Omnitrans.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

35 A speaker who lives near the West 5th Street facility detailed how odors are drawn into the air conditioning at her house.

RESPONSE: Comment noted. The speaker said that they would be willing to participate in the survey to detail the conditions at her house.

36 A speaker asked the investigator to ask her daughter what she had been told was the reason why students could not go outside on August 1, 2003.

RESPONSE: The speaker's daughter stated that the principal said it was too hot.

37 A speaker asked why they are lying about the potential exposure of the children.

RESPONSE: The principal investigator will inquire as to the types of information being transmitted to the children and parents of the school

38 A speaker related her experience with emissions from the Omnitrans facility. The speaker smelled an "awful smell" while driving to a friend's house near the Omnitrans facility and was told by a resident that the smell was gas from Omnitrans. The speaker related that her tongue tingled, the inside of her mouth was numb, her nose was numb, her head started hurting, and her eyes started tearing. The speaker expressed concern for the children of the school and the neighborhood and was concerned that results of the study would not be taken seriously. The speaker noted that the neighborhood is aware of what is happening to them and that they do not believe the problem is being addressed.

RESPONSE: Comment noted. The speaker was asked to write her experience down (which she did) so that it could be included in the study

39 A speaker asked if the experience of visitors (family, friends, etc...) could be included in the study.

RESPONSE: If visitors are willing to sit down with the investigator then their experiences will be documented.

40 A speaker asked who is doing the EIR.

RESPONSE: The speaker was reminded that there is no EIR that the SB 1927 requires a public health and environment assessment and that the scope of work proposed was agreed to by Senator Soto in a letter on April 23, 2003.

41 A speaker asked whether the investigator was aware that the City of San Bernardino and the San Bernardino School Board has given Omnitrans resolutions that request Omnitrans move their fueling site. The speaker further related that Omnitrans has not been a good neighbor and that they need to move.

RESPONSE: At the time of the meeting, the principal investigator was not aware of the resolutions and WRAN has provided copies for review. The concerns of the neighborhood are being documented and included in the report.

5 CLOSURE/LIMITATIONS

Our services have been performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised under similar circumstances by reputable, qualified environmental consultants practicing in this or similar locations. No other warranty, either expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report. These services were performed consistent with our agreement with our client.

Opinions and recommendations contained in this report apply to conditions existing when services were performed and are intended only for the client, purposes, locations, time frames, and project parameters indicated. We do not warrant the accuracy of information supplied by others or the use of segregated portions of this report.

Respectfully submitted,

James Clark, Ph.D.