5.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section evaluates the potential for the Kenwood Village Project to be affected by an accidental release of hazardous materials being transported along the Union Pacific railroad tracks or U.S. 101; the past use of the project site for agricultural purposes and the potential for farm-related chemicals to be present in on-site soils; the use of hazardous materials by residents of the Project; airport-related hazards; wildland fires; and potential impacts related to the emergency evacuation of the Project area. Potential long-term health-related impacts to Project residents resulting from exposure to diesel particulate matter and other emissions from the nearby railroad tracks and U.S. 101 are addressed in Section 5.2, Air Quality.

Hazard-related impacts associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials being transported along the Union Pacific Railroad tracks or U.S. 101 is a regional issue, and the risk of the Project being adversely affected by an accident that results in the release of hazardous materials is generally similar to the risk at other sites in the project region that are located near the freeway and railroad tracks. Since the risk of a hazardous material transportation accident affecting a particular site in the City is similar to the risk at other similarly located sites, the evaluation of potential hazardous material release impacts at the Kenwood Village Project site is based on the risk analysis recently conducted for the Cortona Apartments Project. The Cortona Apartments project is located approximately 4,000 feet to the east of the Kenwood Village project site and is at least 35 feet south of the railroad tracks and 175 feet south of the freeway. The Kenwood Village Project would be approximately 145 feet north of the center median of U.S. 101 and 370 feet north of the railroad tracks.

5.6.1 Physical Setting

Project Site. The main project parcel (077-130-006) and the related pathway parcels that extend to the east (APN 077-141-049) and west (APN 077-130-019) are vacant, and there are no structures on the project site. The main project parcel would be used for the development of the proposed residential units and that parcel was previously used for agricultural purposes. A review of aerial photos indicates that farming operations on the project site ceased sometime around 2005.

A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was prepared (Rincon, 2007) for the project site to identify the possible presence of recognized environmental conditions associated with possible soil and groundwater contamination. A recognized environmental condition is defined as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the property. The Environmental Site Assessment did not detect the presence of aboveground tanks or evidence of underground storage tanks; drums; hazardous substances or petroleum products; unidentified containers; odors; pools of liquid; transformers or hydraulic equipment; or other conditions of concern. The Environmental
Site Assessment did conclude that due to the historic use of the site for agriculture, there is a potential that the property could be affected with pesticides or other chemicals used routinely in agricultural production, which represents a recognized environmental condition.

**Surrounding Properties and Uses.** Single-family residences are located to the north and east of the project site, and condominium units are located adjacent to the project site to the west. Further to the west, a small neighborhood commercial area is located at the intersection of Calle Real and Ellwood Station Road. A drainage ditch and Calle Real are adjacent to the project site to the south, and U.S. Highway 101 and the Union Pacific railroad tracks are south of Calle Real. South of the railroad tracks is a mix of commercial uses and a mobile home park.

The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment included a database search of public lists of sites that generate, store, treat, or dispose of hazardous materials or sites where a release or incident has occurred. The search included properties within one-quarter of a mile of the Kenwood Village Project site. The database search identified nine sites, however, only one of those sites was listed in a database indicative of a hazardous materials release. That site was the 7-Eleven Store west of the project site, and it was listed as a leaking underground storage tank site. A recent query of the State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker\(^1\) website indicated that the 7-Eleven case involved only soil contamination and that the case was closed by the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, Fire Prevention Division in February, 2013. No other active contamination remediation cases were identified in the vicinity of the project site.

**Previous Oil and Gas Exploration.** The project site is located in the abandoned Glen Annie Gas Field. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources Well Finder\(^2\) has no record of wells being developed on the project site. Several wells are located within 1,000 feet of the project site, including two dry holes located to the west of the site, and two plugged wells located to the east of the site.

### 5.6.2 Regulatory Setting

Many federal, state and local regulatory programs have been enacted to protect water, air and land resources from the adverse effects of hazardous material releases. Regulatory programs also address the use, transportation and disposal of hazardous materials and waste; require that major hazardous material users/hazardous waste generators disclose those operations to the public; and ensure that releases to the environment are controlled and remediated in a manner that protects public safety. A brief description of some hazardous material management regulatory programs is provided below.

**Hazardous Material Transportation.** Numerous federal regulations have been enacted to manage the transportation of hazardous materials and waste, including the requirements of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, which is administered by the Department of

Transportation; and the requirements of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, which is administered by the Environmental Protection Agency. These and other regulations establish standards for labeling and manifesting hazardous waste; prescribe minimum safety standards and handling requirements; and require the implementation of appropriate material release response. State oversight of hazardous material transportation is also provided by numerous agencies, including California Highway Patrol requirements for carrier and driver licensing and safety; Department of Toxic Substances Control requirements pertaining to hazardous waste transportation; and Department of Motor Vehicles requirements for hazardous waste hauling vehicle registration and specialized driver certifications.

The Federal Railroad Administration is predominately responsible for rail safety in the U.S. and implements a variety of rail safety programs related to the transportation of hazardous materials, including track and rail car safety requirements. At the State level, the California Public Utilities Commission provides oversight for the transportation of hazardous materials by rail, and conducts inspections of hazardous material shippers.

**Hazardous Material Management.** The management of hazardous materials and wastes is regulated at federal and State levels through programs administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), agencies within the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) such as the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), federal and State Occupational Safety and Health agencies (OSHA), and Office of Emergency Services (OES). The County of Santa Barbara administers a number of federal and State laws and regulations at the local level, and the Hazardous Materials Unit of the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department is certified by CalEPA as the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Santa Barbara County. The CUPA regulates businesses that handle hazardous materials, generate, treat hazardous waste, or operate aboveground or underground storage tanks. The primary goal of the CUPA Program is to protect public health and the environment by promoting compliance with applicable laws and regulations. The CUPA is responsible for the following six consolidated environmental and emergency response programs:

- Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventories (Business Plans)
- California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program
- Underground Storage Tank Program
- Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act (APSA) Program
- Hazardous Waste Generator and Onsite Hazardous Waste Treatment (tiered permitting) Programs

**Pesticide Use.** The California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) is vested with primary authority through the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to enforce federal and state
laws pertaining to the proper and safe use of pesticides. DPR’s enforcement of pesticide use in the field is largely carried out by the County Agricultural Commissioner.

5.6.3 Thresholds of Significance

The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual contains thresholds for assessing the significance of impacts to public safety resulting from the involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. The manual also identifies specific types of facilities and activities that the thresholds are applicable to, and provides guidance for the assessment of hazardous material-related risk.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines contains a checklist of environmental factors to be assessed to evaluate the potential for a project to result in significant hazard-related impacts. The checklist includes the following thresholds to be used to evaluate potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

c. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

d. For a project located within an airport land use plan, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

e. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

f. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

The proposed Project would not result in the use of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school and would not be located near a private airstrip. Therefore evaluation of those Appendix G thresholds is not required.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) provides additional guidance that is applicable to the evaluation of impacts related to hazards. This section provides that the EIR must analyze any
significant environmental effects the project might cause by bringing development and people into an affected area; and also states that the EIR should evaluate any potentially significant impacts of locating development in areas susceptible to hazardous conditions as identified by authoritative hazard maps, risk assessments, or land use plans addressing such hazards.

5.6.4 Impact Evaluation

Hazardous Material Transportation

This section evaluates the potential for the proposed Project to be adversely affected by an accidental release of hazardous materials being transported along the UPRR tracks and U.S. 101. A similar analysis was recently completed for a project in the City that is also located adjacent to the UPRR and U.S. 101 (Cortona Apartments Final EIR, Rincon, 2014). The same methodology used for the analysis of the Cortona Apartments project has been used to evaluate the potential hazardous material transportation risk impacts that could affect the Project.

UPRR Tracks. Freight trains travel along the UPRR adjacent to the project site, and some of the trains carry hazardous materials that could be released to the environment as a result of an accident. The public health risk posed by an accidental release would depend upon a variety of factors, including the type(s) of hazardous materials involved, the manner in which the material is released, the amount that is released, the toxicity of the released material, the distance between the railroad tracks and affected areas, and the wind direction that could carry emissions from the release. The prevailing weather pattern at the time of release would affect the rate of dilution and the direction of transport of any gaseous or volatilized materials. Proposed residential units on the project site would be a minimum of approximately 370 feet from the rail line.

The potential risk of exposure to hazardous materials resulting from a rail accident is evaluated in terms of probabilities. The probability that a release will occur is determined by a combination of the probability of an accident, the probability that the released cargo is hazardous, and the probability that winds are blowing from the spill toward occupied receptor sites.

Dangerous cargo represents approximately six percent of total freight movement in the United States. The predominant wind direction in the Project area is from the south, therefore, the wind blows from the tracks toward the project site approximately half of the time. For this analysis, a release of hazardous materials was assumed to require derailment of rail cars carrying hazardous cargo. The derailment history of freight trains in the United States for the ten-year period 2001 through 2010 was 0.005 derailments per one-million ton miles of cargo. At 10 to 12 freight trains travelling through the region per day, each averaging 2,500 tons of freight per train, the tracks adjacent to the project site carry approximately 1,000,000 tons per year. The rail segment adjacent to the project site (approximately 0.2 miles) carries approximately 200,000 ton-miles. The risk of derailment adjacent to the project site is calculated as follows:
• 200,000 ton miles x 0.005 derailments per ton-mile per year = 0.001 derailments/year = once every 1,000 years.

As calculated, the statistical probability of a derailment adjacent to the project site is once every 1,000 years. The risk of adverse impacts from the release of hazardous materials caused by a derailment is calculated as follows:

• One derailment every 1,000 years x 0.06 (6 percent) probability of hazardous cargo x 0.5 (50 percent) probability of adverse wind direction. This equals one derailment adjacent to the project every 30,000 years that could result in the release of hazardous materials and potentially significant health impacts.

The probability of injuries or fatalities at the project site may be somewhat less than the calculated probability as people located inside their residence could be shielded from the impacts of the release. For example, buildings and walls could provide protection from radiant heat should the derailment result in a fire.

The risk of train derailment with or without hazardous material release is statistically extremely low – approximately the risk level of meteor strike. However, the Goleta General Plan FEIR (Subsection 3.7-2, Transport) determined that despite the low probability and the implementation of regulatory requirements that reduce the risk of an accidental release, impacts associated with the transportation of hazardous materials on the rail lines through the City is a significant and unavoidable impact. The FEIR also concluded that the risk of exposure to a hazardous material release caused by a transportation accident will be increased in the City due to new development located near the railroad tracks.

The probability of the Project being affected by an accidental release of hazardous materials from trains traveling near the project site is extremely low, however, the consequences of a release could be significant should an accident and major release occur. Therefore, based on the analysis conclusion of the Goleta General Plan FEIR, potential train-related hazardous material transportation impacts are considered to have a significant and unavoidable (Class I) impact on the Project. The City Council adopted a statement of overriding considerations for this impact when it certified the FEIR for the General Plan.

**U.S. Highway 101.** The annual average daily truck traffic on U.S. 101 at Storke Road in 2011 was 3,175, which was 9.8 percent of the total highway vehicle annual average daily traffic. The majority of the truck traffic (59 percent) was trucks with five or more axles. In 2007, trucks transported the largest volume of hazardous materials through the nation’s transportation system, moving 1.2 out of 2.2 billion tons of hazardous materials. These shipments accounted for 104 billion highway ton-miles, out of the total 323 billion ton-miles moved by all transportation modes. The total ton-miles of all materials transported by truck in 2007 were $1.3 \times 10^{12}$. Approximately 13.7 percent of materials transported by truck were classified as hazardous while...
7.7 percent of the ton-miles transported involved hazardous materials. Since this level of detail on trucking of hazardous material in California could not be located, the nationwide data has been used to estimate the potential risk to the Project.

The accident rate for trucks transporting hazardous materials is estimated to be $3.2 \times 10^{-7}$ per mile. The vast majority of incidents involving truck releases will not impact resources located more than a few thousand feet from the place of the accident. To be conservative, the analysis has assumed that accidents that occur within a half mile of the project site (one mile segment) have the potential to impact the site. Therefore, the probability of an accident involving a truck on U.S. 101 within a one-mile segment near the project site is calculated as follows:

- $3,175 \times 365 \times 0.077 \times 3.2 \times 10^{-7} = 0.029$ or one accident every 35 years.

An accident involving a truck carrying hazardous material does not always result in the release of the material. The Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) *Handbook of Chemical Hazard Analysis Procedures* (1989) estimates that approximately half of accidents result in a release, including very minor valve and fitting leaks. Omitting those, a spill may result from an accident about 15 to 20 percent of the time. After applying the more conservative assumption of 20 percent, the probability of a truck accident releasing hazardous material on U.S. 101 within one half mile of the project site is $0.029 \times 0.2 = 5.8 \times 10^{-4}$, or once every 1,700 years. Table 5.6-1 presents the probability of release by cargo type.

The risk of major truck accident on U.S. 101 near the project site, with or without a hazardous material release, is statistically extremely low – approximately the risk level of meteor strike. However, the Goleta General Plan FEIR (Subsection 3.7-2, Transport) determined that despite the low probability and the implementation of regulatory requirements that reduce the risk of an accidental release, impacts associated with the transportation of hazardous materials on U.S. 101 through the City is a significant and unavoidable impact. The FEIR also concluded that the risk will be increased by new development in the City located near the freeway. The probability of the Project being affected by an accidental release of hazardous materials from trucks traveling on U.S. 101 is also extremely low, however, the consequences of a release could be significant should an accident and major release occur. Therefore, based on the analysis conclusion of the Goleta General Plan FEIR, potential truck-related hazardous material transportation impacts are considered have a **significant and unavoidable (Class I)** impact of the proposed Project. The City Council adopted a statement of overriding considerations for this impact when it certified the FEIR for the General Plan.
Table 5.6-1
Hazardous Materials Truck Shipment Characteristics by Hazard Class in 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Description</th>
<th>Tons (thousands)</th>
<th>% Total (Tons)</th>
<th>Ton-miles (millions)</th>
<th>Average miles per shipment</th>
<th>Probability of Release (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,231,133</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>323,457</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.80E-04 (once every 1,724 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1, Explosives</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>8.12E-07 (once every 1,232,000 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2, Gases</td>
<td>250,506</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>55,260</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.51E-05 (once every 15,360 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3, Flammable liquids</td>
<td>1,752,814</td>
<td>78.56</td>
<td>181,615</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.56E-04 (once every 2,190 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4, Flammable solids</td>
<td>20,408</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>5,547</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>5.28E-06 (once every 189,400.0 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5, Oxidizers and organic peroxides</td>
<td>14,959</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>7,024</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>3.89E-06 (once every 257,100 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6, Toxic (poison)</td>
<td>11,270</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>5,667</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>2.96E-06 (once every 337,800 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 7, Radioactive materials</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.16E-07 (once every 8,621,000 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 8, Corrosive materials</td>
<td>114,441</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>44,395</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.98E-05 (once every 33,560 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 9, Miscellaneous dangerous goods</td>
<td>63,173</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>23,002</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1.64E-05 (once every 61,000 yrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rincon, 2014

(1) The probability of release for each class of hazardous materials is calculated by multiplying the total probability of release (5.8E-04) (.00058) by the % total tons for each class. For example, the probability of release for Class 1 is calculated by multiplying 0.00058 (5.8E-04) times .0014 (14%), which equals 0.0000000812 (8.12E-7).

Agriculture-Related Soil Contamination

The project site has historically been farmed and agricultural operations ceased in 2007. Due to the previous use of the project site for agricultural purposes, it is reasonable to assume that herbicides and pesticides were applied to the site sometime in the relatively recent past. If residual concentrations of herbicides and pesticides are present in the project site soil, the disturbance of the site by grading and construction activities could have the potential to result in health impacts to on-site workers and nearby residents, primarily through the creation of dust that could transport contaminants. The potential for the project to result in health-related impacts due to the presence of residual herbicides and pesticides in on-site soils is considered to be a potentially significant and mitigable (Class II) impact.
Other Hazards

This section evaluates the potential for the Kenwood Village Project to result in significant environmental impacts resulting from the Project’s use of hazardous materials, potential airport-related safety conflicts, wildland fire hazards, and project-related effects associated with the evacuation of the project area.

**Hazardous Material Use.** Households often use a variety of products that contain toxic substances. These products can include items such as household cleaners, painting and automotive products, garden products, hobby supplies, and pool chemicals. The use and improper disposal of these types of products have the potential to result in adverse environmental effects. The use of common household-type substances by residents of the Project would not be substantial and is not considered to have a significant potential to result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, the Project’s hazardous material use impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

**Airport Hazards.** The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is located near the geographical center of the City of Goleta, and the end of the nearest airport runway is approximately 6,500 feet southeast of the project site. Runway protection zones have been established for the Airport to minimize potential aircraft-related hazards. Safety Area 1 (Clear Zone) is the most restrictive safety area in terms of allowable land uses and are located at the ends of the airport runways. Safety Area 2 (Approach Zones) are extensions of the Clear Zone and extend about two miles to the east and west beyond the ends of the Airport’s main east-west runway. Land uses that may be compatible within the Approach Zone include low-density single-family dwellings, transportation and communication facilities, and specified manufacturing, warehouse, commercial, and recreation uses. Proposed land uses within the Approach Zone that would attract large concentrations of people are to be reviewed by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Commission.

The location of the Airport runway safety zones are depicted by General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR Figure 3.7-1 (EIR Figure 5.6-1). In the vicinity of the project site, the boundary of Safety Area 2 is south of and adjacent to U.S. 101. Therefore, the project site is located near but outside of the Airport’s established runway safety zones. As a result the Project would not result in a significant safety hazard for people residing on the project site and the Project’s airport hazard-related impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

**Wildland Fire Hazards.** General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR Figure 3.7-1 (EIR Figure 5.6-1) identifies certain areas within Goleta as having a high wildland fire hazard. The designated high hazard area closest to the project site is north of Cathedral Oaks Road, approximately one-half mile north of the site. Based on the separation distance between the project site and the nearest designated high fire hazard area, the Project would not expose people
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or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires and the Project’s wildland fire hazard-related impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

**Evacuation Route Conflicts.** The primary access to and from the project site would be along Calle Real, which is a two-lane arterial. The project would also provide an emergency secondary access that would connect to Tuolumne Drive north of the project site. Should an evacuation of the project area be required, additional traffic generated by the proposed 60 residential units would not substantially increase the number of vehicles leaving the project area. Therefore, the Project would not physically interfere with an emergency evacuation and its evacuation-related impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

### 5.6.5 Cumulative Impacts

**Hazardous Materials.** The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR identified a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact resulting from the risk associated with the transport of hazardous materials through the City along U.S. 101 and the Union Pacific railroad tracks. The Final EIR also concluded that the overall risk associated with the transport of hazardous materials would increase due to buildout of the General Plan and the development of additional residential uses near the freeway and railroad tracks. The potential for an accident-related exposure to hazardous materials is statistically very low. However, the cumulative risk of such exposure associated with the introduction of additional population near freeway and railroad tracks is considered significant and unavoidable and the project’s contribution would be considered cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable (Class I) cumulative hazardous material transportation-related impact.

**Agriculture-Related Soil Contamination.** A review of aerial photos dating back to 1994 indicates that recent farming activities have not occurred on the cumulative development sites identified on EIR Table 4.1-1 (Related Projects) located near the project site (i.e., the Citrus Village project). The implementation of proposed mitigation measures would reduce the potential for project-related exposures to residual herbicides and pesticides to a less than significant level and it appears unlikely that the development of other nearby projects would contribute to this potential impact. Therefore, cumulative impacts resulting from possible exposure to residual concentrations of agricultural chemicals is considered to be less than significant (Class III).

**Other Hazards.** Residents of the proposed project would incrementally increase in the City the use of household products that can be hazardous if used or disposed of improperly. The project-related increase in the use of these substances, however, would not be substantial or cumulatively considerable. The project site is located near but outside of an established airport runway safety zone. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in airport-related safety risks. The project site is approximately one-half mile south of a designated high wildland fire hazard area, and due to that separation distance would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in fire safety impacts in the City. Should an evacuation of
the project site and project area be required, the primary evacuation route would be along Calle Real. Other cumulative development projects in the vicinity of the project site identified on EIR Table 4.1-1 (Related Projects) that would also use Calle Real include the Citrus Village project (10 units) and the Robinson lot line adjustment project (four additional single family dwellings). The cumulative additional traffic that would be added to Calle Real should an evacuation be required would not be substantial or cumulatively considerable. In conclusion, the Kenwood Village Project would not substantially contribute to potential hazard-related impacts in the project area and the Project’s cumulative hazard-related impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

5.6.6 Mitigation Measures

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The City has very limited control over the type and volume of hazardous materials that are transported through the region, and the enforcement of applicable safety regulations are primarily the responsibility of various state and federal agencies. Therefore, there are no feasible mitigation measures the City can implement that would further reduce the very low probability that the Kenwood Village Project would be significantly impacted by an accidental release of hazardous materials being transported on U.S. 101 or the UPRR tracks. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable (Class I).

Although feasible mitigation measures to reduce this impact to a less than significant level are not available, the following conditions of approval are recommended. The purpose of the following recommended conditions of approval are to notify project site residents of the potential risks associated with hazardous material transportation activities that occur near the project site.

Recommended Conditions of Approval

- The permittee must develop response procedures to be implemented in the event that a release of hazardous materials has the potential to adversely affect project site residents. Appropriate response procedures may include, without limitation, measures for sheltering in place, and measures for the evacuation of the project site. The response procedures must be approved by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review before issuance of a building permit.

- The permittee must develop a notice to property owners regarding the potential risks of upset associated with the Project’s location near the UPRR and U.S. 101. The notice to property owners must be reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review and the City Attorney, and then recorded before issuance of a building permit.
Significant and Mitigable Impacts

Impact HAZ-1  Former farming operations on the project site could have used agricultural chemicals such as herbicides and pesticides. As a result, there is a potential that residual concentrations of agricultural chemicals exists in project site soils that would be disturbed by grading and construction activities.

HAZ-1a. Soil Management Plan. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a soil management plan for the project site must be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of the Director. The objective of the soil management plan is to provide guidance for the proper analysis, handling, on-site management, and disposal/treatment of soil that is identified as being impacted due to the former use of agricultural chemicals on the project site. The plan must identify practices that are consistent with applicable regulations and standards including, without limitation, to the requirements of the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health, and the local Certified Unified Program Agency soil remediation standards.

To confirm the absence or presence of hazardous substances associated with former agricultural operations, a soil sampling and testing strategy shall be identified and implemented. The soil management plan must identify the following:

- Methods and standards for identifying impacted soil.
- Procedures for impacted soil excavation and storage.
- Proposed impacted soil treatment or disposal methods.
- Verification sampling to confirm that applicable soil remediation standards have been achieved.

When necessary, identified contaminated soil must be remediated under the supervision of an environmental consultant licensed and approved by the Director to oversee such remediation and under the direction of the lead oversight agency (Santa Barbara County Public Health Department).

Residual Impact. The proposed requirement to determine if on-site soils have been impacted by former farming operations would dictate what type (if any) of remediation actions may be required. Implementing approved procedures to test on-site soils, implement appropriate corrective actions, and verify the effectiveness of the site remediation would reduce the potential for impacts associated with the potential exposure to residual farm chemicals to a less than significant level.