

4.5 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section describes the potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts that could result from potential presence of and risk of exposure to hazardous materials associated with previous uses of the City Fire Station 10 Project site. The information presented in this section pertaining to hazardous materials at the site is based in part on a site closure summary report prepared by Holguin, Fahan & Associates (2012), in association with remediation of residual hydrocarbons in on-site soils. This report is provided in Appendix F.

4.5.1 Existing Setting

Goleta General Plan/Local Coastal Land Use Plan

Based on the Goleta General Plan/Local Land Use Plan, Safety Element (City of Goleta 2016), and the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) (City of Goleta 2006), the Project site has not been designated as an area of environmental constraints with respect to hazards and hazardous materials. The nearest environmental constraints include the Venoco Ellwood Onshore Facility, located approximately 1,300 feet west of the Project site, and the immediately adjacent (to the north) railroad and highway transportation routes, on which hazardous materials are transported. In addition, the Project site has not been identified as a Hazardous Materials or Leaking Underground Fuel Tank (LUFT) site in the City of Goleta Coastal Hazards Vulnerability Assessment and Fiscal Impact Report (City of Goleta 2015).

Project Site Setting

From 1968 to 1993, a gasoline service station operated at the Project site. In 1993, the service station was demolished, including two 10,000-gallon gasoline underground storage tanks (USTs), one 6,000-gallon gasoline UST, one 1,000-gallon used oil UST, two fuel dispenser islands, product and vent piping, and two hydraulic lifts. Petroleum hydrocarbon soil contamination discovered beneath the former dispenser islands was remediated with soil vapor extraction, from 1994 to 1996. Confirmation soil samples collected in 1997 indicated hydrocarbon concentrations below Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division (FPD) Site Investigation Levels (SILs) (i.e., action levels) for all locations except in the vicinity of one boring, drilled through the former southern dispenser island location. Soils at that location contained total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), as gasoline, of 810 milligrams per kilograms (mg/kg). Based on the limited amount of remaining contamination, all soil vapor extraction wells were abandoned and case closure was issued by County FPD for the Project site in 1997 (Holguin, Fahan & Associates 2012, Appendix F).

In 2007, a Phase I environmental site assessment was completed for the Project site. Based on the previous site usage as a service station and lack of groundwater assessment data, the Phase I recommended additional assessment. Although no

groundwater was encountered to a maximum depth of 100 feet below ground surface, elevated petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations were detected at a depth of 15 to 20 feet beneath the former southern gasoline dispenser island. TPH as gasoline, benzene, and methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) were detected at concentrations of 20,700 mg/kg, 52 mg/kg, and 0.28 mg/kg, respectively. Those samples also contained N-butylbenzene, sec-butylbenzene, tert-butylbenzene, naphthalene, isopropylbenzene, n-propylbenzene, 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, and 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, at concentrations that correlated to samples containing elevated TPH as gasoline and benzene concentrations. The area of elevated petroleum hydrocarbon contamination was determined to be localized, with an estimated volume of less than 400 cubic yards (Holguin, Fahan & Associates 2012, Appendix F).

Soil vapor extraction was used to remediate the contaminated soils, from August 2010 to June 2011. Soil samples collected from subsequent confirmation borings indicated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons in excess of FPD SILs. However, the FPD agreed (with Holguin, Fahan & Associates) that the soil vapor extraction system had removed over 90 percent of the initial mass of contaminated soil and concurred that further corrective action was not warranted. A sensitive receptor survey was completed, based upon readily available public records, site and vicinity inspections, and site assessment results. Based on the residual soil contamination and sensitive receptor survey, a low-risk case closure summary was presented to the FPD. The summary concluded that the Project site has been adequately assessed and that the residual hydrocarbons in soil do not pose a significant threat to human health, to beneficial or potentially beneficial groundwater, or to the environment. As such, Chevron and Holguin, Fahan & Associates requested that the FPD review the site for low-risk closure. Site closure was granted by the FPD in a letter dated February 21, 2012 (Holguin, Fahan & Associates 2012, Appendix F).

4.5.2 Regulatory Setting

The term “hazardous material” refers to both hazardous substances and hazardous waste. A material is identified as “hazardous” if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a Federal, State, or local regulatory agency or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency. A “hazardous waste” is a “solid waste” that exhibits toxic or hazardous characteristics. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has defined the term “solid waste” to include many types of discarded materials including any gaseous, liquid, semiliquid, or solid material, which is discarded or has served its intended purpose, unless the material is specifically excluded from regulation. Such materials are considered waste whether they are discarded, reused, recycled, or reclaimed. The EPA classifies a material as hazardous if it has one or more of the following characteristics at specific thresholds: ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, and/or toxicity.

The County of Santa Barbara administers a number of federal and State laws and regulations at the local level. In addition, the Uniform Fire Code adopted by the County and the Uniform Building Code, which has been adopted into the Goleta Municipal Code (Title 15) include requirements pertaining to hazardous materials and hazardous wastes, which are monitored and enforced at the local level.

The Hazardous Materials Unit (HMU) of the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services, is certified by CalEPA as the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Santa Barbara County. The CUPA regulates businesses that handle hazardous materials, generate or 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. All inspectors in the County of Santa Barbara CUPA Program are trained Hazardous Materials Specialists who take part in continuous education program to ensure consistency and uniformity during inspections.

The overall CUPA requirements are found in Health & Safety Code (HSC) Chapter 6.11 and California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 27, Division 1, Subdivision 4, Chapter 1. The County of Santa Barbara CUPA is responsible for the following six consolidated environmental programs:

- Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans & Inventory ("Business Plan") - Authority: HSC Chapter 6.95, Article 1 & Title 19 CCR Chapter 4;
- Underground Storage Tanks Authority: HSC Chapter 6.7 & Title 23 CCR, Division 3, Chapters 16 & 17;
- Hazardous Waste Generators Authority: HSC Chapter 6.5 & Title 22 CCR Division 4.5;
- Onsite Hazardous Waste Treatment ("Tiered Permit") Authority: HSC Chapter 6.5 & Title 22 CCR Division 4.5;
- Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act (APSA) Authority: HSC Chapter 6.67; and
- California Accidental Release Prevention ("CalARP") Authority: Chapter 6.95, Article 2 & Title 19 CCR Chapter 4.5.

The Hazardous Materials Business Plan Program requires businesses handling hazardous materials in quantities in excess of specified quantities to submit inventories of those materials to the CUPA, and to develop appropriate employee training and emergency procedures. The thresholds are:

- 55 gallons for a liquid;
- 500 pounds for a solid; and
- 200 cubic feet (at standard temperature and pressure) for a gas.

The CUPA maintains the inventory and emergency contact information submitted from businesses in a computerized data management system. The CUPA, in turn, provides this information to emergency response agencies.

City of Goleta Regulations. The Safety Element in the Goleta General Plan contains policies intended to reduce the potential for hazardous materials to adversely affect people and property, including the following:

SE 10.1 Identification of Hazardous Materials Facilities. [GP] *The City shall work with Santa Barbara County Fire Department's Hazardous Materials Unit to maintain up-to-date lists and maps of facilities in Goleta that involve the storage, use, and/or transport of hazardous materials.*

SE 10.2 Compliance with Law. [GP] *The storage, handling, and disposal of any hazardous material shall be done only in strict compliance with applicable City, state, and federal law.*

SE 10.4 Prohibition on New Facilities Posing Unacceptable Risks. [GP] *The City shall not allow new hazardous facilities or expanded hazardous facilities that would expose existing residential or commercial development to unacceptable risk. New or expanded hazardous facilities in proximity to existing residential and commercial development shall incorporate appropriate mitigation measures to minimize potential risks and exposure.*

SE 10.6 Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party. [GP] *No new development or substantial redevelopment shall be permitted on land determined to contain actionable contamination until the party responsible for such contamination has been identified and has accepted financial responsibility for any required remediation. The posting of a bond or other appropriate surety in an amount and form acceptable to the City shall be required as a condition of development approval. In appropriate circumstances, the City may assist in attempting to obtain outside grants or other resources to address contamination issues and help fund remediation.*

4.5.3 Impact Analysis

Methodology and Significance Thresholds

The City of Goleta'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 establishes categories for identifying potential significant impacts to public safety including transportation of hazardous materials, as well as potentially significant impacts to non-hazardous land uses proposed in proximity to existing hazardous facilities. The manual specifically identifies a potentially significant impact to all development proposed in proximity to one or more existing hazardous facilities.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) provides guidance regarding consideration and discussion of significant environmental impacts related to hazards:

- The EIR shall also analyze any significant environmental effects the project might cause by bringing development and people into the affected area.
- The EIR should evaluate any potentially significant impacts of locating development in areas susceptible to hazardous conditions as identified in authoritative hazard maps, risk assessments, or land use plans addressing such hazards.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines contains a checklist of environmental factors to be assessed to determine the potential for significant impacts, including the following for hazardous materials:

- 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.

The prior certified Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that impacts related to hazardous emissions, hazardous materials transport, hazardous materials release, airport safety, and emergency evacuation would not be significant; therefore, these issues are not further addressed in this EIR.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential impacts related to hazardous materials and associated mitigation measures are discussed below.

Impact HAZ-1: Fire Station 10 development would occur on property previously occupied by a service station with leaking fuel dispensers, which could potentially create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. This would result in an adverse, but less than significant (Class III) impacts related to hazardous materials.

The Project site is not located on the Cortese Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List, which has been compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (California DTSC 2017). However, the site was previously occupied by a Chevron service station, which resulted in petroleum hydrocarbon soil contamination beneath one of the fuel dispenser islands as a result of fuel leaks. Following multiple phases of environmental site assessments and soil remediation, using soil vapor extraction technology, Santa Barbara County FPD indicated that the remediation system had removed over 90 percent of the initial mass of contaminated soil and that further corrective action was not warranted. The remaining soil contamination is approximately 15 to 20 feet below ground surface. A sensitive receptor survey, based upon readily available public records, site and vicinity inspections, and site assessment results, concluded that the Project site was adequately assessed and that the residual hydrocarbons in soil do not pose a significant threat to human health, to beneficial or potentially beneficial

groundwater, or to the environment. County FPD agreed with this synopsis and as a result, site closure was granted by the FPD in a letter dated February 21, 2012 (Holguin, Fahan & Associates 2012, Appendix F). As a result, Fire Station 10 development would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment and impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

As impacts on hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant, no mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

4.5.4 Cumulative Impacts

Region of Influence

The Region of Influence for evaluating cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials includes those areas in which related past, present, and reasonably probable projects would have the potential to contribute to hazardous materials spills and associated soil and/or groundwater contamination in the vicinity of the Project site. Therefore, all related projects located immediately adjacent to the site would be within the Region of Influence with respect to spill-related soil contamination, and all related projects located hydrologically upgradient of the Project site would be within the Region of Influence with respect to groundwater contamination.

Impact Assessment

Cumulative development in and around Goleta, including the proposed Project, would add 2,746 residential units (including 1,000 student beds in a new dormitory at UCSB) and more than 1.5 million square feet of commercial and industrial space (see Tables 3-1 and 3-2 in Section 3.0, Related Projects). Additional development would be located on infill sites throughout the community, as well as large tracts of undeveloped open spaces along the area's urban perimeters. However, the area immediately surrounding the Project site has been developed with residences and a golf course. Facilities storing and handling hazardous materials that may have spilled such substances in the past or would potentially spill such substances in the future are not present in the vicinity of the site. Similarly, groundwater was not encountered to a maximum depth of 100 feet beneath the Project site during prior environmental site assessments. Groundwater below that depth generally flows toward the south. Industrial facilities capable of causing a large contaminated groundwater plume are not located north of the Project site, or north of the adjacent railroad and highway. No known regional contaminated groundwater plumes are known hydrologically upgradient of the site. Therefore, the potential for offsite properties to have contributed to hazardous materials spills, contaminated soil, or contaminated groundwater that might have migrated beneath the Project site is low.

The proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts resulting from fuel spills at the former service station are negligible, as soil remediation has been completed to the satisfaction of County FPD, such that residual hydrocarbons in soil do not pose a significant threat to human health, to beneficial or potentially beneficial groundwater, or to the environment. In addition, these residual impacts would be confined to the Project site. As a result, the Project's contribution to potential cumulative impacts would be *less than considerable*.

This page intentionally blank