

4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

INTRODUCTION

*This section addresses hazards associated with the Project that may potentially affect public health and safety or degrade the environment. This section summarizes the findings of two reports: 1) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, southeast corner of Orange Street and Wilson Avenue and the southwest corner of Brand Boulevard and Wilson Avenue, Glendale, California prepared by Converse Consultants, and; 2) Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Los Angeles County APNs 5642-002-094 and 5642-002-095, Glendale California prepared by Alpha Environmental. These reports are contained within **Appendix 4.7** of this Draft EIR. The purpose of the reports was to identify the environmental conditions on the site, including the likely presence of any hazardous substances or conditions that indicate an existing release, past release, or a material threat of a release into structures or onto property, or into the ground, ground water, or surface drainages on the site.*

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Conditions

The Project site is presently a vacant lot within Glendale's downtown. The site is generally level, irregular-shaped plot of land covering approximately 58,600 square feet (1.3 acres) of land area. The site is presently undeveloped with landscaped trees lining the north, west, and east sides.

The site is located along the south side of Wilson Avenue between Orange Street and Brand Boulevard. The Project site is located approximately 0.5 mile south of State Highway 134 (Ventura Freeway), approximately 1.5 miles east of Interstate 5 (Golden State Freeway) and approximately 2 miles west of State Highway 2 (Glendale Freeway).

Definitions

Hazardous Material

A number of properties may cause a substance to be considered hazardous, including toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, or reactivity. A hazardous material is defined as:

"...a substance or combination of substances which, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical or infectious characteristics, may either: (1) cause, or significantly contribute to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating irreversible illness; or (2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or environment when

improperly treated, stored, transported or disposed of or otherwise managed.” (Title 22, California Code of Regulations [CCR], Section 66084)

Hazardous Waste

A “hazardous waste” is defined as “any hazardous material that is abandoned, discarded or recycled.” (California Health and Safety Code, Section 25124) In addition, hazardous wastes occasionally may be generated by actions that change the composition of previously nonhazardous materials. The same criterion that render a material hazardous make a waste hazardous: toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, or reactivity.

Phase I ESA Methodology and Findings

A Phase I ESA or Preliminary Environmental Site Screening was performed for all properties. The Phase I ESA was prepared in conformance with *American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E: 1527-00 Environmental Site Assessment Practice*. The investigation included: a review of current federal, state, and county databases of known and potential environmentally impacted properties; a review of reasonably available government agency records; a review of available historical aerial photographs and historical maps; a review of environmental reports and documents pertaining to the site at the City of Glendale, and a project site reconnaissance to observe current conditions at the Project site. Recognized Environmental Concerns (RECs) identified in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment included a former on-site dry cleaner and introduced fill found within the basement areas of former buildings on site. Specific findings are described below.

Federal and State Database Review

A government database report, prepared by Environmental Data Resources (EDR) of available federal, state, and county agency databases was reviewed to identify government regulated properties having known recognized environmental conditions and potential environmental concerns within the vicinity of the Project site. Off-site locations of concern identified by EDR within a maximum 1-mile radius from the Project site were also addressed. Descriptions of the government databases reviewed are detailed in the EDR report. Also included in the EDR report are maps illustrating the location of listed properties relative to the location of the Project site. A complete copy of the EDR report, dated December 28, 2005, is provided in **Appendix 4.7** of this Draft EIR.

A summary of properties that could not be mapped by EDR due to poor or inadequate address information is also included in the EDR reports. Based on a review of the unmappable properties, none were identified through a review of the available addresses and/or a visual site visit, which was either on

or adjacent to the Project site. The pertinent findings of the government database review are summarized below:

- The Project site was not identified on the databases researched by the EDR report.
- Adjacent properties on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and HAZNET¹ lists as registered generators of hazardous or petroleum wastes include: Home Savings of America at 1000 North Brand Boulevard, Quantum Photo Center at 132 North Brand boulevard, Sheppard Associates at 130 N Brand Boulevard, and W.F.C. Ventures L.P. at 130 N Brand Boulevard. One parcel is listed on the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act-Small Quantity Generators (RCRIS-SQG)² and EPA lists: the California Environment and Natural Defense Inc. at 100 N Brand Boulevard Unit 322. Being a registered generator of wastes does not indicate that a release has occurred on the parcel.
- There are a number of properties within 0.25 mile of the Project site boundary that are identified in the EDR Report. Most of these properties are listed on the HAZNET or RCRIS-SQG lists as waste generators. Being a generator of hazardous waste does not indicate that a release has occurred. Four properties are listed on the Active Underground Storage Tank List (UST), four properties are listed on the Cal-EPA Facility Inventory Database (CA FID UST) - Historical database of active and inactive UST sites, and 15 properties are listed on the SWRCB Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database (HIST UST) – Historical database of UST sites. Three properties are listed on the Leaking Underground Storage Tank List (LUST) including 76 Station #0353 at 200 S. Central Avenue (which has been demolished and hazardous conditions remediated), 500 North Brand Partnership at 550 North Brand Boulevard, and Mobil #1 1-GHW at 250 South Glendale Avenue. There is a low probability that the listed off-site properties have impacted the Project site due to regulatory status, type of resource affected is soil only, a responsible party has been identified, a regulatory agency is involved in remedial efforts, the location of each site with respect to the direction of regional groundwater flow, and/or the distance of each site from the Project site. Four properties are listed on the SCAQMD Emissions Inventory Data (EMI) – Database of toxics and criteria emissions. One property is listed on the CLEANERS list; Dons Cleaners at 205 West Wilson Avenue. One property is listed on the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) Hazardous Material System Street Number List (HMS) – Database of industrial waste and underground storage tank sites; Pacific Bell at 124 South Orange Street.

¹ The HAZNET data is extracted from copies of hazardous waste manifests received each year by the California Department of Toxic Substance Control.

² The RCRIS database includes selected information on sites that generate, store, treat, or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The source of the database is the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Physical Setting

Geology

The Project is located approximately 540 feet above mean sea level with surface topography sloping downward toward the southwest.³ The site is underlain by unconsolidated and semi-consolidated alluvium, lake, playa, and terrace deposits.⁴

Groundwater

The nearest groundwater well to the Project site is approximately 0.5 mile southeast of the site. The well was last measured in May 2005 with a recorded groundwater depth of 99.9 feet below ground surface. According to simulated groundwater contours for Fall 2003 published by the Upper Los Angeles River Area (ULARA) Watermaster, groundwater beneath the Project site is approximately 115 feet below ground surface and flows towards the Los Angeles River to the south-southwest.

The Project site is in the vicinity of an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designated National Priorities Listing (NPL) known as San Fernando Valley (Area 2), Crystal Springs Wellfield Area. The San Fernando Valley is known for its regional groundwater contamination stemming from historic uses of volatile organic compounds (VOC) in the area. The San Fernando Valley groundwater system (San Fernando Basin) has been studied and monitored by federal and state regulatory agencies for the past 24 years. The groundwater beneath the Project site may or not be contaminated due to its location near the region.

Potable Water Supplier

Potable water is supplied by Glendale Water & Power (GWP) via local wells and a treatment facility, and through the purchase of imported water from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD).

Historical Review

Aerial Photograph and Map Review

Copies of historical aerial photographs dated 1929, 1939, 1944, 1945, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1962, 1966, and 1970, Sanborn Maps dated 1908, 1912, 1919, 1925, and 1970, and an USGS Map dated 1966 were reviewed to identify government regulated properties having known recognized environmental conditions and potential environmental concerns within the vicinity of the

³ United States Geological Survey [USGS] Topographic Map, Burbank, California, 1966 photorevised 1972

⁴ Division of Mines and Geology, Geologic Map of California, 1991.

Project site. Review of these materials indicates that the site has been occupied by stores, offices, and a warehouse beginning in the 1920s and extending through the early 1980s. The most prominent structure being the Webb's of Glendale department store that operated from circa 1930 until the building was destroyed by fire in 1976. All structures which occupied the Project site were demolished beginning in 1984. Refer to **Appendix 4.7** for a complete discussion of the historic aerial photography and map review.

Building Permit Review

Available building permits were reviewed at the City's Department of Building & Safety. A summary of the historical development of the site is presented below. The types of permits reviewed range from minor modifications to existing buildings or associated utilities to building permits for new office and commercial buildings. Refer to **Appendix 4.7** for a complete discussion of the historic aerial photography and map review.

Property Reconnaissance

On Site

There are no buildings located on the Project site.

Adjacent Properties

Adjacent properties around the Project site were observed for evidence of recognized environmental conditions. City Center I and the Glendale Galleria are located south of the Project site. Commercial/retail shops and businesses are located along the north side of Wilson Avenue, west side of Orange Street, and east side of Brand Boulevard. No recognized environmental conditions were observed on the adjacent properties at the time of the site visit.

Subsurface Soils

In order to evaluate whether subsurface soils at the Project site have been impacted by volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from the former on-site dry cleaning facility, and to screen on-site soil fill materials for common urban contaminants, a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment consisting of a laboratory analysis of soil and vapor samples was conducted. The findings of the Phase II study are summarized below. A complete copy of the Phase II can be found in **Appendix 4.7** of this Draft EIR.

The sampling work program consisted of the following:

- Completion of six soil borings using a direct-push method up to a depth of 10 feet below ground surface (bgs), and collection of soil gas samples from the borings; and
- Advancement of four hand-augered soil borings to a depth of 5 feet bgs, and collection of soil samples at depths of 2 feet and 5 feet bgs.

Subsurface soil conditions on the Project site were generally brown poorly graded silty-sand (USCS classification SP) to a depth of approximately 10 feet bgs, the maximum depth of exploration. Soil samples were generally dry and no staining or odors were observed in the soil samples collected. The permeability of the shallow soil offered acceptable vapor flows at 0 inches of water vacuum for valid sample collection.

A total of eight soil gas samples were collected from the six vapor borings (B1 through B6) drilled for the investigation in the vicinity of the former dry-cleaning facility. All samples were analyzed on-site for VOCs using a Hewlett Packard 5890 Series II Gas Chromatograph equipped with a Flame Ionization Detector (FID) and an Electron Capture Detector (ECD). Based on the laboratory analysis of soil samples, no VOCs were detected above laboratory reporting limits in any of the eight samples analyzed. Laboratory analysis of the eight soil samples collected indicated no concentrations of Total Recoverable Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TRPH) above reporting limits for any of the soil samples analyzed. Title 22 metals were detected in the soil samples during the EPA Method Series 6000/7000 analyses; however, the concentrations of these metals found present were at levels considered as background or naturally occurring; and no VOCs were detected above laboratory reporting limits in the two samples.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds for determining the significance of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are contained in the environmental checklist form contained in Appendix G of the most recent update of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*. Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are considered significant if the Project would:

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

- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school (issue is addressed within **Appendix 1.0(a), Notice of Preparation**).
- 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (issue is addressed within **Appendix 1.0(a), Notice of Preparation**).
- For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (issue is addressed within **Appendix 1.0(a), Notice of Preparation**).
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- 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 (issue is addressed within **Appendix 1.0(a), Notice of Preparation**).

Impact Analysis

Each applicable threshold of significance is listed below followed by analysis of the significance of any potential impacts and the identification of mitigation measures that would lessen or avoid potential impacts. Finally, the significance of potential impacts after implementation of all identified mitigation measures is presented.

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

Impact Analysis: The Project would include the delivery and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and other materials. These materials are typical of materials delivered to other commercial-retail uses directly adjacent to the Project site. Existing federal and state laws adequately address risks associated with the transport of hazardous materials. These include regulations outlined in the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, administered by the U.S. Department of Transportation. The California Department of Transportation is mandated to implement the regulations established by the U.S. Department of Transportation, which are published as the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 49, commonly referred to as 49 CFR. With regard to the transportation of hazardous materials and wastes, these regulations govern the manufacture of packaging and transport containers; packing and repacking; labeling; and the marking of hazardous material transport. Any transport of hazardous materials to the Project site would be subject to the federal and state regulations described above. Potential impacts are

considered to be less than significant through the implementation of standard state and federal requirements.

Commercial-retail uses proposed on site might store and use hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and other materials. These materials would be stored on site in small quantities. A variety of state and federal laws govern the generation, treatment, and/or disposal of hazardous wastes. Glendale's Fire Department and Los Angeles County have the authority to inspect on-site uses and to enforce state and federal laws governing the storage, use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes. In addition, Los Angeles County requires an annual inventory of hazardous materials in use on site, as well as, the submission of a business emergency plan for annual review, as required by Emergency Planning and Right-to-Know Act (SARA Title III) and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code. These requirements would be mandated according to state and federal law. As such, potential impacts are considered to be less than significant through the implementation of standard state and federal requirements.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Threshold: 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.

Impact Analysis: Glendale's standards for contamination clean up are as follows: Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) gasoline to 100 parts per million (ppm), TPH Diesel and Heavy-end hydrocarbons to 1,000 ppm, and for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) such as Benzene to 10 parts per billion (ppb), Toluene to 1 ppm, Ethylene Benzene to 6.8 ppm, Xylenes to 17 ppm, Perchloroethylene (PCE) to 55 ppb and Methyl-Tertiary-Butyl-Ether (MTBE) to 143 ppb.

A site specific Phase I Environmental Site Assessment called out two potential areas of concern that are identified below:

- **144 North Orange** – This area represents a low to moderate risk for contamination due to the presence of a former dry cleaning establishment.
- **131-139 North Brand Boulevard** – This area contains unidentified fill materials placed in the basement areas of former buildings on site.

To address these areas, a Phase II Site Assessment was conducted for both locations. Vapor testing conducted at the location of the former dry cleaners did not detect VOCs above laboratory reporting limits in any of the eight vapor samples analyzed. Concerning the former building basement areas, soil testing did not detect concentrations of Total Recoverable Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TRPH) above reporting limits in any of the eight soil samples analyzed. Furthermore, while Title 22 metals were detected in soil samples from the basement areas; the concentrations of these metals were at levels considered as background or naturally occurring. Finally, no VOCs were detected above laboratory reporting limits in two soil samples taken from the basement areas. Based on the above, no significant impact would occur with Project construction and operation.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Threshold: Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled by Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Impact Analysis: The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project site addressed potentially hazardous conditions on the site. The Phase I ESA identified the site as being historically occupied by a cleaner. However, subsequent Phase II testing has determined on-site soils are not impacted by the release of VOCs, TRPH, or priority pollutant metals. Based on the findings of the Phase II study, impacts during Project construction and operation are considered less than significant.

The likelihood that all properties listed on various government databases within 0.25 miles of the Project site have impacted the site is low due to regulatory status (historical UST or waste generator), distance from the site, and down-gradient locations of the site. Based on these findings, impacts as a result of Project construction and operation are considered less than significant.

The Project site is identified in the EDR report to be within the boundary of a National Priority List (NPL or Superfund) Crystal Springs Wellfield Area. There is no indication that the site has contributed to the regional ground water problem. The ground water below the site is located at least 80 feet or more below the surface, and the Project would include excavation for subterranean garages up to 40 feet below the surface. Since this would not be deep enough intercept contaminated groundwater, construction activity would not expose workers to a health hazard.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

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

Impact Analysis: According to the City of Glendale Safety Element, Brand Boulevard, which borders the Project site on the east, is a City disaster response route, and Colorado Street, which is one block south of the Project site, is a County evacuation route. These routes are the main thoroughfares to be used by emergency response services during an emergency and, if the situation warrants, the evacuation of the area. Implementation of the Project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along these roadway segments in the area nor result in the placement of an impediment to the flow of traffic such as medians. In the event of an emergency, all lanes would be opened to allow for traffic flow to move in one direction and traffic would be controlled by appropriate agencies, such as the Glendale's Police Department. During the construction activities, the Project would include short-term single lane closures along these routes, which could slow down evacuation along these routes and result in a significant impact.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Significant.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure is provided to reduce short-term impacts associated with construction of the Project:

4.7-1 The construction contractor shall notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Department of construction activities that would impede movement (such as a lane closures) along Brand Boulevard or Colorado Street to allow emergency response teams to reroute traffic to an alternative route, if needed.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The potential for cumulative impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials was assessed, based upon consideration of the Project and related projects in the City of Glendale. These related projects are identified in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**. The applicable threshold is listed

below in bold followed by an analysis of the cumulative impact of the Project and related projects, and their potential significance.

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

Impact Analysis: It is anticipated that related projects would result in an incremental increase in the amount of hazardous materials transported, used, treated, stored, and disposed areawide. Although each development site has potentially unique hazardous materials considerations, it is anticipated that all hazardous materials delivered and hazardous waste removed from the Project site and each cumulative project site would be in accordance with Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations. In addition, related projects (if applicable) would be required to prepare an annual inventory of hazardous materials used on site and submit a business emergency plan to the City for an annual review, as required by Emergency Planning and Right-to-Know Act (SARA Title III) and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code. For these reason, cumulative impacts associated with related projects would be less than significant.

As discussed above, the Project would not result in significant public hazards as a result of hazardous materials used, treated, stored, or disposed. The Project would comply with all applicable laws and regulations related to the transport, use, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. Because Project impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level, the Project's contribution to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Threshold: 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.

Impact Analysis: It is possible that a number of the related projects would involve significant renovation or demolition activities, which could subject construction workers or other persons to health and safety risks through exposure to hazardous material. The individual workers or persons potentially affected by exposure would vary from project to project. It is anticipated that each related project would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local requirements that regulate worker and public safety. As a result, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. The Project, as well as, related projects would adhere

to established regulations. Consequently, Project impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

It is also possible that a number of the related projects could expose construction workers and other persons to contaminated soil. It is anticipated that future development would adhere to applicable federal, state, or local laws, and regulations that govern underground storage tanks, as well as the disposal and clean up of contaminants. As a result, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. As the Phase II study conducted for the Project site did not detect soil contaminants above laboratory reporting limits, Project impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Threshold: Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled by Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Impact Analysis: Related projects may be located on or near a site included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. It is anticipated that development of these related projects would comply with applicable laws and regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes, and that risk with identified hazardous material sites would be eliminated or reduced through proper handling, disposal practice, and/or clean up procedures. Development would be denied by the City if adequate clean-up or treatment is not feasible. Accordingly, cumulative impacts to the public or environment associated with development on or near listed contaminated sites would be less than significant. As no hazardous material sites were identified on the Project site, Project impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

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

Impact Analysis: Construction and development associated with related projects could result in activities that interfere with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans, primarily by temporary construction barricades or other obstructions that could impede access. It is anticipated that future development would go through CEQA review of potential impacts on adopted emergency response or evacuation plans, and would be required to implement measures to mitigate potential impacts. As a result, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. The Project's construction impacts on emergency response or evacuation plan implementation due to temporary construction barricades or other obstructions that could impede an adopted emergency access response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be mitigated. As a result, the Project's contribution to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.