

CHAPTER IV. D

Hazardous Materials and Hazards

1 **1. Environmental Setting**

2 The following information is provided in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section
3 15125. By describing existing regulations already applicable to the project, the
4 information presented in this section helps focus the “Discussion of Significant Effects”
5 on those environmental aspects of the project which are not resolved by existing
6 regulations. Additional background detail is provided in Appendix C.

7 **a. Study Area for Direct Impacts**

8 The study area for direct impacts related to hazardous materials potentially extends to
9 include the Santa Maria Airport Land Use Plan area to the south of the project site that
10 would encompass any other hazardous materials migration plume from past land uses
11 on site (e.g., auto repair activities). Project-specific impacts on hazardous materials are
12 bounded by the project site boundaries, including any specific areas where these
13 materials have been previously used (e.g., auto repair activities). In reference to
14 potential hazards from Santa Maria Public Airport overflight, the study area includes
15 flight tracks associated with that facility’s runway.

16 **b. Study Area for Cumulative Impacts**

17 The study area for cumulative impacts on hazardous materials and hazards is the same
18 as direct impact area, including unincorporated areas adjacent to the project site.

19 **c. Existing Physical Conditions in the Study Area(s)**

20 **i. Hazardous Materials**

21 A Phase I Site Assessment of the project site (Oilfield Environmental and Compliance,
22 Inc [OEC] 2003), site reconnaissance identified numerous commercial structures
23 associated operations of a multiple-franchised automobile dealership. All commercial
24 activities at the site, as well as all facilities were on the southern half of the parcel.

25 Prior to development of the existing onsite facilities, temporary barracks were
26 constructed during World War II. These were subsequently removed, and by the late
27 1950s, a Chevron gas station was constructed, which remained in operation until the late
28 1970s (OEC 2003). Soil remediation records associated with the closure of the gas station
29 were unavailable. At the time of its particular closure, the regulatory requirements for
30 such actions were far less stringent. However, no data were identified indicating the
31 presence of improper hazardous material remediation onsite. Auto dealerships that
32 contained service bays that used oil and gasoline were constructed in the 1980s.

33 **ii. Airport Traffic Hazards**

34 The primary potential hazard affecting the project site is associated with Santa Maria
35 Public Airport flights. The Santa Maria Public Airport (SMX) exists to the
36 approximately 2000 feet southwest of the project site; Santa Maria Airport District land
37 adjacent and south of Skyview Drive boundary is used for agricultural row crops. In

1 particular, the potential airport hazard would result from an unlikely accident involving
2 an airplane crash, or loss of a section of the aircraft's body or fuel, with the potential to
3 impact people and/or structures on the ground.

4 The Caltrans Aeronautics Program and the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use
5 Commission (ALUC) are responsible for evaluating project land use compatibility
6 relative to airport activity within Santa Barbara County. In conformance with its
7 mandates, the ALUC prepared and adopted the *Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use*
8 *Plan* (reprinted October 1993) that addresses land use compatibility with surrounding
9 uses, aircraft noise, and accident potential. The ALUP (Santa Barbara County 1993)
10 designates Airport Safety Areas extending from runways as a basis for determining land
11 use compatibility. In order of proximity to the runway end, they are: Area 1 (Runway
12 Protection Zone/Clear Zone [RPZ]); Area 2 (Approach Zone); and Area 3 (Airport
13 Traffic Pattern Zone). The ALUP identifies criteria for acceptable development within
14 each of the Airport Safety Areas to ensure the safe passage of aircraft over these
15 properties (airspace protection), and to minimize safety hazards associated with airplane
16 flight. The proposed project shall be reviewed and approved by the Airport Land Use
17 Commission (ALUC) prior to final decision maker hearings. In the event that approval is
18 not granted by the ALUC, the project shall be returned to the decisionmakers for further
19 discretionary review pursuant to P.U. Code Sections 21670-21678.

20 The project site is within the Santa Maria Public Airport Influence Area (AIA) Safety
21 Area 3, Airport Traffic Pattern Zone. Safety Area 3 Airport Traffic Pattern Zone is the
22 area in which airport traffic patterns occur. It is the least restrictive in terms of allowable
23 land uses, allowing for residential, visitor commercial (e.g., hotels), and public service
24 areas. Within Safety Area 3, if a project site is not located “downwind and base legs or
25 departure paths of frequently used traffic patterns,” there are no restrictions on the
26 number of employees or residents, structural height, and guidelines regarding
27 compatibility of various land uses within adjacent safety area zones (Santa Barbara
28 County 1993). The absence of potential restrictions on the Lakeview Promenade project
29 has been verified by SBCAG staff (personal communication, William Yim 2008).

30 Additionally, AB 2776 requires that a “Buyer Beware Notice of Airport in Vicinity”
31 declaration be issued to any person potentially purchasing or leasing subdivided lands
32 within an AIA. The declaration explains that the property is potentially subject to
33 annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations, including
34 noise, vibration, and odors and requires that the property owner not hold the airport or
35 airline responsible for these affects. As the project is within the Airport Influence Area
36 (AIA), a “Notice of Airport in Vicinity” would be required to be provided to future
37 tenants (personal communication, William Yim 2008).

38 ***d. Project Design Elements that Reduce Hazardous Materials Impacts***

39 The proposed project does not include any elements to specifically address potential
40 hazardous materials or airport traffic hazard impacts.

- 1 *e. Adopted Policies and Regulations that Reduce Hazardous Materials Impacts*
- 2 1. If required by Santa County Fire Department Environmental Hazards
3 Division, the proposed project shall include required remediation of any
4 hazardous wastes prior to construction of new mixed use and residential
5 units. Remediation of any hazardous wastes that may exist on the project
6 site shall be consistent with Santa Barbara County Fire
7 Department/Hazardous Materials Division requirements.
- 8 2. All existing structures shall be surveyed prior to demolition for asbestos-
9 containing material (ACM). If ACMs are identified, removal procedures
10 shall be developed pursuant to the California Air Resources Board’s
11 Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Emissions of Asbestos from
12 Construction, Grading, Quarry, and Surface Mining Operations, and shall
13 be reviewed and approved by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution
14 Control District prior to issuance of grading permits.
- 15 3. Future commercial tenants shall develop an emergency response plan in
16 coordination with the Santa Maria Fire Department and surrounding
17 residential and educational uses within 500 feet of the project site
18 boundaries. The emergency response plan shall be developed in
19 coordination with the Santa Maria Fire Department and surrounding
20 residential and educational uses within 500 feet of the project site
21 boundaries. The plan shall be updated annually to reflect potential
22 hazards associated with specific hazardous materials used by commercial
23 tenants.
- 24 4. Commercial tenants (where appropriate) shall prepare Hazardous
25 Materials Business Plans (HMBP) that includes: a list of the types and
26 quantities of hazardous materials/waste to be stored on-site; and
27 hazardous material storage design specifications. HMBPs for each
28 commercial tenant shall also include provisions of the project emergency
29 response plan. The HMBP shall include a list of the types and quantities
30 of hazardous materials/waste to be stored on-site, hazardous material
31 storage design specifications, and a Hazardous Materials Business Plan
32 (HMBP). The HMBP shall include a list of the types and quantities of
33 hazardous materials/waste to be stored on-site, hazardous material
34 storage design specifications as well as provisions of the project
35 emergency response plan.
- 36 5. The proposed project shall be reviewed and approved by the SBCAG
37 Airport Land Use Commission.
- 38 6. The following Notice of Airport in Vicinity declaration shall be included
39 for all residential units and future property transactions by homeowners
40 within the proposed project:

1 *This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known*
2 *as the airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of*
3 *the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations*
4 *(i.e., noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary*
5 *from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any,*
6 *are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine*
7 *whether they are acceptable to you.*

8 **2. Consideration and Discussion of Significant Environmental Effects**

9 The following information is provided in accordance with Section 15126.2 of the CEQA
10 Guidelines.

11 **a. Environmental Considerations Suggested in CEQA**

12 Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines suggests that a development project could have a
13 significant effect on *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, if the project would result in the
14 following situations:

- 15 (1) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the
16 routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 17 (2) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through
18 reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the
19 release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- 20 (3) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous
21 materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or
22 proposed school?
- 23 (4) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials
24 sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a
25 result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the
26 environment?
- 27 (5) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan
28 has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use
29 airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or
30 working in the project area?
- 31 (6) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project
32 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project
33 area?
- 34 (7) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted
35 emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

1 (8) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death
 2 involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to
 3 urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

4 **b. Rationale for Establishing Local Thresholds**

5 Local thresholds of significance are derived from those in CEQA Appendix G,
 6 Environmental Checklist, given that regulations governing hazardous materials and
 7 hazards are consistent throughout the state, and are refined as appropriate to
 8 incorporate locally specific conditions.

9 The proposed project is not affected by the following conditions and development of the
 10 proposed project would not result in the exceedance of the following CEQA Guidelines
 11 Appendix G threshold criteria, and therefore these are not discussed further:

- 12 - For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a
 13 safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

14 *Response: The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.*

- 15 - Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency
 16 response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

17 *Response: The proposed project site is an urban infill site with adequate public access.*
 18 *Proposed emergency access to proposed residential and commercial structures would be*
 19 *subject to standard City of Santa Maria Fire Department review and approval.*

- 20 - Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving
 21 wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or
 22 where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

23 *Response: The proposed project site is within the City of Santa Maria and in a low fire*
 24 *hazard area.*

25 **c. Thresholds of Significance Established in this EIR**

26 Applicable CEQA Appendix G, Environmental Checklist thresholds of significance as
 27 refined to reflect local conditions are used in this EIR. The project would produce a
 28 significant hazardous materials or hazards impact if it would exceed any one of the
 29 following thresholds:

30 **HAZ-1:** Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials
 31 sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a
 32 result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the
 33 environment?

34 **HAZ-2** Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through
 35 reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the
 36 release of existing subsurface hazardous materials?

1 **HAZ-3:** Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous
2 materials, substances or waste such as asbestos during demolition of
3 existing structures within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed
4 school?

5 **HAZ-4:** Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the
6 routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

7 **HAZ-5:** Would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working
8 in the project area resulting from Santa Maria Public Airport airplane
9 traffic?

10 *d. Significant Direct Impacts*

11 **Potential Effect HAZ-1:** *The proposed project site is not included on a list of hazardous*
12 *materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 such that proposed*
13 *excavations would not create a known significant hazard to the public or the environment.*

14 The project site is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials
15 sites, including sites which are under investigation, where cleanup actions are planned,
16 or have been completed, compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5
17 (California EPA, Cortese List). The prior Phase I Site Assessment (OEC 2003) included
18 review of pertinent resources maps available at the California Department of
19 Conversation’s Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, which revealed no wells
20 have been drilled on the subject parcel. Further, an Environmental Data Resources
21 (EDR) record report, which researched listed sites within the ASTM specified radius,
22 was also conducted in 2003. According to the EDR research, the subject property is not
23 listed as a hazardous waste site, Federal or State fuel tank site, or small quantity
24 generator. All Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST’s) listed within one-half mile
25 of the project site have either been subject to measures requiring remediation and have
26 been signed off by regulatory agencies, or are under current regulatory monitoring
27 (OEC, 2003).

28 An additional environmental records search was conducted for the project site as part of
29 this EIR (January 25, 2008). Hazard identification records were utilized to identify
30 known or suspected areas of contamination, underground storage tank locations, solid
31 waste management facilities, and hazardous waste treatment, storage, and/or disposal
32 locations. These include: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Online (RCRA),
33 National Priorities List (NPL), Superfund Sites, California Department of Toxic
34 Substances- EnvironStor, Geotracker (LUFT sites, SLIC sites, land disposal sites, DOD
35 [non-UST] sites, Wells, UST sites). No hazardous materials records were identified.
36 Therefore, proposed project grading would not be expected to encroach within known
37 hazardous materials.

38 **Conclusion:** *As the proposed project site is not identified on a list of hazardous materials sites*
39 *compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the potential for construction grading*
40 *to encroach within known hazardous materials is less than significant.*

1 **Potential Effect HAZ-2:** *No evidence of subsurface hazardous material contamination is*
2 *known onsite, but could potentially be encountered during excavations.*

3 As stated in Potential Effect HAZ-1, the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment completed
4 for the proposed project site (OEC 2003) did not identify evidence of contaminated soils
5 onsite. Several uses including former automobile repair equipment bays, however, could
6 have released small amounts of hazardous materials over time. In the event that unknown
7 contaminated soil is encountered during demolition and grading, the SBCFD Hazardous
8 Materials Unit would be contacted and necessary standard remediation measures imposed.

9 **Conclusion:** *Imposition of standard Santa Barbara County Fire Department Hazardous Materials*
10 *Unit remediation measures would reduce potential effects resulting from encountering previously*
11 *unknown hazardous materials to less than significant.*

12 **Potential Effect HAZ-3.** *Demolition and removal of structures could result in the*
13 *dispersion of asbestos fibers.*

14 Demolition or removal of commercial structures which disturbs asbestos-containing
15 materials may cause the release of asbestos fibers into the air.

16 Existing buildings on the project site could potentially have been constructed with
17 asbestos containing building material (ACBM). Existing structures would be
18 demolished, potentially resulting in the release of asbestos fibers into the environment
19 and potential health impacts on community members.

20
21 If ACBMs are identified, removal procedures would be developed pursuant to the
22 California Air Resources Board's (CARB) Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Emissions
23 of Asbestos from Construction, Grading, Quarry, and Surface Mining Operations. These
24 standard procedures would be reviewed and approved by the Santa Barbara County Air
25 Pollution Control District prior to issuance of grading permits.

26 **Conclusion:** *Imposition of standard California Air Resources Board and Santa Barbara County Air*
27 *Pollution Control District asbestos removal measures would reduce potential effects resulting from*
28 *encountering asbestos-containing materials to less than significant.*

29 **Potential Effect HAZ-4:** *Project buildout could result in the release of hazardous*
30 *materials due to storage and use of such substances.*

31 Common open space area landscaping maintenance in planned development
32 neighborhoods would potentially require storage of substances used for landscape
33 maintenance, including solvents and oil for operating and cleaning equipment. These
34 are classified as hazardous or toxic materials and could require a Hazardous Material
35 Business Plan (HMBP), depending on the amount stored. Professionals with knowledge
36 of standard hazardous materials handling requirements would be expected to manage
37 maintenance activities for the multiple-family residences and open space areas. The
38 amount of hazardous materials stored in each residential unit would not be substantial,
39 so that resulting hazards would be negligible and *less than significant.*

40 A variety of commercial uses would be possibly accommodated onsite, including many
41 requiring the use and storage of hazardous materials, such dry cleaners. Due to greater

1 quantities and diversity of chemicals that would be stored on site for commercial tenants
2 and for residential common space landscaping described above, the project area would
3 potentially be subject to releases of hazardous substances from accidental spills and/or
4 chemical reactions. Sensitive receptors within approximately 500 feet of such a
5 hazardous material release could be affected, dependent upon the particular chemical
6 and meteorological conditions at the time of accidental release.

7 The City Fire Department would regulate hazardous materials pursuant to the Uniform
8 Fire Code to ensure adequate hazardous material spill containment, confinement, and
9 suppression equipment (i.e., sprinklers). This would be included in the proposed project
10 design. These specific requirements would be addressed as City Fire Department
11 conditions of approval. Standard Fire Department conditions would regulate proper fire-
12 retardant building materials, roofing, number of hydrants and adequate water pressure
13 for hydrants and sprinklers, and internal road surfaces.

14 ***Conclusion:** Storage of hazardous materials within residential units would be minimal or be*
15 *managed by professionals with knowledge of standard hazardous materials handling*
16 *requirements. The City Fire Department would regulate commercial use hazardous materials*
17 *pursuant to the Uniform Fire Code. Potential effects on hazardous material storage would be less*
18 *than significant.*

19 **Potential Effect HAZ-5:** *Proposed project land uses would be potentially consistent*
20 *with ALUP guidelines for development within the Santa Maria Public Airport Influence*
21 *Area (AIA) Safety Area 3, Airport Traffic Pattern Zone.*

22 The Lakeview Promenade project area is located within Safety Area 3 (General Airport
23 Traffic Pattern Area) of the Santa Maria Public Airport. According to ALUC staff
24 guidance, sensitive residential land uses would be acceptable in Safety Area 3, as they
25 would not be located within the airport's approach zones. The proposed project would
26 be reviewed by the ALUC, and a Notice of Airport in Vicinity declaration would be
27 required for all residential units and future property transactions by homeowners within
28 the proposed project.

29 ***Conclusion:** Proposed residential land uses would be in Safety Area 3 and outside of Santa*
30 *Maria Public Airport approach zones such that potential effects related to airport flight hazards*
31 *would be less than significant.*

32 **e. Significant Cumulative Impacts**

33 No significant cumulative hazardous waste impacts are identified. All related projects
34 within the City of Santa Maria and the cumulative impact study area, in addition to the
35 proposed project and those located unincorporated areas adjacent to the project site,
36 would be required to comply with existing state and local regulatory hazardous
37 materials and hazards regulations.

38 ***Conclusion:** Cumulative impacts on hazardous materials and hazards would be less than*
39 *significant. The project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than cumulatively*
40 *considerable.*

1 **3. Mitigation Measures Adopted to Mitigate Significant Effects**

2 The following information is provided in accordance with Section 15126.4 of the CEQA
3 Guidelines.

4 **a. Measures that Mitigate Direct Impacts**

5 **Response to Potential Effect HAZ-1**

6 Not applicable. As proposed project potential effects on hazardous materials would be
7 *less than significant*, no mitigation measures are required.

8 **Response to Potential Effect HAZ-2**

9 No mitigation measures would be required, as standard Santa Barbara County Fire
10 Department Hazardous Materials Unit remediation measures would ensure impacts
11 would be *less than significant*.

12 **Response to Potential Effect HAZ-3**

13 No mitigation measures would be required, as imposition of standard California Air
14 Resources Board and Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District asbestos
15 removal measures would ensure impacts would be *less than significant*.

16 **Response to Potential Effect HAZ-4**

17 No mitigation measures would be required, as imposition of City Fire Department
18 regulations pursuant to the Uniform Fire Code would ensure impacts would be *less than*
19 *significant*.

20 **Response to Potential Effect HAZ-5**

21 Not applicable. As proposed project potential effects on airport flight traffic hazards
22 materials would be *less than significant*, and the standard Notice of Airport in Vicinity
23 declaration would be imposed, no mitigation measures are required.

24 **b. Measures that Mitigate Cumulative Impacts**

25 No mitigation measures would be required, as imposition of Santa Barbara County Fire
26 Department Hazardous Materials Unit, California Air Resources Board, Santa Barbara
27 County Air Pollution Control District, and City Fire Department regulations and
28 procedures pursuant to the Uniform Fire Code would ensure impacts would be *less than*
29 *significant*.

- 1 *c. Substantial Evidence that Mitigation Will be Effective.*
- 2 Standard procedures Adopted Policies and Regulations 1-6 have been developed by
- 3 state and local agencies including the DTSC, Santa Barbara County Fire Department,
- 4 Santa Maria City Fire Department, and Santa Barbara County ALUC to address the
- 5 potential impacts on hazardous materials and hazards.