3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

3.9.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes existing hazards and hazardous materials conditions at the project site and on surrounding properties, summarizes relevant laws and policies, and analyzes the anticipated impacts of implementing the Proposed Action or any of the alternatives to the Proposed Action.

Sources of information used in this analysis include the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (PVSP) EIR prepared by Placer County (2006), and Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments performed on the properties that make up the project site.

3.9.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The project site consists primarily of agricultural/pasture land, with rural residential properties scattered throughout the site. Previous and current land uses consist of dry farming for hay and cattle grazing, and irrigated farming for rice cultivation and enhanced cattle grazing. The western portion of the project site includes an approximately 979-acre (396.2 hectares) Special Planning Area that consists mostly of rural residential-agricultural parcels ranging in size from 1 to 40 acres (0.4 to 16.2 hectares).

For the purposes of this analysis, the term "hazards" refers to risk associated with exposure to hazardous materials, proximity to high-voltage transmission lines, exposure to electromagnetic fields, or exposure to recycled water. Potential hazards related to toxic air contaminants are discussed in **Section 3.3, Air Quality**.

Hazardous material is defined in different ways, depending on different laws and regulations administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Each has its own definition of a "hazardous material."

U.S. EPA and EPCRA (Right-to-Know) reporting requirements use the terms "hazardous chemicals" and "extremely hazardous substances." The term "hazardous chemical" refers to any chemical, element, chemical compound(s), or mixture(s) of elements and/or compounds with "hazardous" characteristics. Rather than developing a complete list of hazardous chemicals, the law defines five hazardous characteristics. These are: acute, chronic, fire, reactive and sudden release of pressure. If a chemical exhibits one or more of these characteristics, it is considered to be a hazardous chemical under this program. Similarly, if a formulation of several chemicals exhibits one or more of these characteristics, the formulation is a hazardous chemical.

The California Health and Safety Code Section 25501 defines hazardous materials as:

- any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or biological characteristics, poses a potential hazard to human health or safety, or to the environment. Hazardous materials include, but are not limited to hazardous substances, hazardous wastes, and any material which a handler or the administering agency has a reasonable basis for believing

that it would be injurious to the health and safety of persons or harmful to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment.

Hazardous wastes are hazardous materials that no longer have practical use, such as substances that have been discarded, discharged, spilled, or contaminated, or are being stored prior to proper disposal. In California, hazardous waste is a discarded material that meets any of a list of criteria in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), including:

- The waste exhibits the characteristics of hazardous wastes identified in CCR Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3. Such characteristics include whether the material is ignitable, corrosive, reactive, or toxic.
- The waste is listed, contains a constituent that is listed, or is a mixture of hazardous waste that is listed in CCR Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11.

Hazardous materials may include products such as pesticides, petroleum products, solvents, chemical intermediates, and heavy metals. Hazardous waste may include spent, discarded, spilled, or contaminated products, or wastes from certain industrial processes, as well as a mixture (e.g., soil, water, carbon, construction debris, and building materials) that exhibits the characteristics of hazardous wastes. California regulates hazardous waste management under CCR Title 22, Division 4.5.

The need for and the level of remediation of soil or groundwater affected by hazardous materials at a site depend on specific site conditions, including planned site use, potential receptors, and exposure pathways. Cleanup requirements are typically evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the lead regulatory agency overseeing a site.

3.9.2.1 Past and Current Hazardous Materials Use

Past use of hazardous materials on the project site as identified during the Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment process has included application of agricultural chemicals and storage and use of petroleum hydrocarbon products.

Agricultural Chemicals

Current and past agricultural use of the project site properties has included rice production, dry farming for hay production, and irrigated and dry land cattle grazing. Use of herbicides and pesticides is commonly associated with the production of rice. No records found during the environmental site assessment process indicate which agricultural chemicals may have been used on the project site for rice production. According to the environmental site assessments, hay production and cattle grazing land uses involved the use of relatively small amounts of fertilizers and feeds that were unlikely to have resulted in residual impacts to soil and groundwater.

Almond orchard and vineyard cultivation is also known to have taken place on the project site. Two almond orchards were identified in aerial photographs taken between 1952 and 1971 of the southern portion of Property #5C. An interview with the owner of Property #5C indicated that there was an almond orchard on the property when it was purchased in 1952, although the age of the orchard was not

known. A Bluestone copper sulfate/water mixture was reportedly sprayed on the orchard trees. A representative of the Placer County Agricultural Commissioner's office indicated that copper sulfate has no residual in soil. Reports also indicated that almond orchards were located on Properties #8 and #9 prior to and leading up to the 1950s. A 1937 aerial photograph of the eastern portion of the project site indicates that commercial orchards existed in that area at least as far back as that date.

Vineyards were identified in aerial photographs of Property #5B from 1971 to 2001 and in photographs of Property #5C from 1987 to 2001. Reports from Agricultural Commissioner's office representatives indicate that vineyards on the project site are not known to use environmentally persistent pesticides and fungicides that pose risks to soil and groundwater quality. The owner of Property #5B indicated that only sulfur has been applied to the vineyards on his property.

Some agricultural chemicals have the potential to remain in near-surface soils, depending upon the concentrations and types used. During approximately the last 25 years, environmentally persistent chemicals such as DDT and Chlordane have been banned from use. Prior to such regulation, however, and especially during the 1940s and 1950s, DDT was a common commercial chemical available for use as a pesticide. Arsenic-based compounds, including lead arsenate, arsenic trioxide, and copper acetoarsenate (Paris green), were also used from the late 1880s to the 1950s. Lead arsenate was commonly applied as both a pesticide and herbicide in orchards, and perhaps in other crops (such as vineyards). The Phase II assessment for former orchard areas did not identify any permanent negative impacts to subsurface soil and groundwater from current and past uses of agricultural chemicals.

Petroleum Hydrocarbon Contaminants

There are no regulatory agency database records of existing or former underground storage tanks (USTs) on the project site. The nearest reported operating USTs are located at the Gibson Ranch County Park in Sacramento County, and at the Riego Market & Deli located at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road and Riego Road, west of the project site. Neither UST facility has had reports of subsurface petroleum releases.

Aboveground storage tanks have been identified on the project site. Small drip zones associated with the aboveground tanks on Property #15 were identified during the environmental site assessment process. However, farm-related aboveground storage tanks were not identified as a common source of soil and groundwater contamination on the project site during the environment site assessment process.

Interviews with property owners during the environmental site assessment process indicated that a UST exists on Property #5C, and that a former UST has been removed from Property #2. Evidence suggesting the presence of USTs was also observed on Property #4, near the abandoned radio beacon building and near a former radio beacon building site, approximately 2,000 feet (609 meters) southeast of the existing beacon building.

Evidence of petroleum hydrocarbon soil contamination was observed on Property #15A, which is associated with operation, maintenance, and storage of farm machinery and equipment. Additionally, used oil filters were observed on Properties #7 and #10. Areas of potential concern and/or circumstances

requiring further study were also observed on seven properties (#2, #1B, #5B, #5C, #9, #11, and #18). Those concerns included dumping along publicly accessible roadways, open abandoned wells, and debris and burn pits in former structure and storage areas.

3.9.2.2 Potential Hazards Related to Old Buildings

The Phase II Environmental Site Assessment included sampling and analysis of potential asbestos-containing materials. An asbestos survey was conducted for the abandoned radio beacon structure located immediately south of Baseline Road on Property #7. Non-friable asbestos-containing materials were found in the shingles on the exterior of the structure. Based on the age of the structures on Properties #10, #15A, #16, #17, and #20, asbestos containing materials could potentially be present in the structures.

3.9.2.3 Vector Control

The project site is within the boundaries of the Placer Mosquito Abatement District. The District employs a number of practices in order to reduce mosquitoes and other vector populations and prevent the spread of the diseases they can carry. District technicians continuously conduct surveillance throughout the County to locate vector breeding grounds including creeks and wetlands as well as manmade features in agricultural, industrial, and residential areas. Additionally, individual property inspections are conducted upon request of the owner. Airplanes and individual sprayers are used to apply insecticides and larvicides to control adult populations and to prevent larva from hatching in these identified breeding grounds. Additionally, residents may obtain mosquito fish from the district at no fee to place in decorative ponds, unused swimming pools, and animal troughs in order to eliminate mosquito larva.

3.9.2.4 Transmission Lines and Electromagnetic Fields

The project site is crossed by existing electric transmission and distribution lines that are part of Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), and Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) systems. A 375-foot-wide SMUD and WAPA easement traverses the project site in a northeast to southwest alignment located west of 16th Street. The other two PG&E easements are smaller in area and run generally north to south. Transmission lines on-site range in size from 115 kilovolts (kV) to 230 kV.

Transmission power lines and substations emit electromagnetic fields, or EMF, which is a natural consequence of electrical circuits and is present where electricity is used. The magnitude of the electric field is primarily a function of the configuration and operating voltage of the line and decreases with the distance from the source. Magnetic fields are present whenever current flows in a conductor, and are not dependent on the voltage present on the conductor. The strength of these fields also decreases with distance from the source.

Studies of the effects of EMF exposure have varied widely (DHS 1999). Some epidemiological studies have reported that children living near power lines have higher than average rates of leukemia, brain cancer, and/or overall cancers. The correlations between EMF exposure and cancer rates have not been strong, and typically have not been related to dose levels. Other epidemiological studies have shown no

correlation between living near power lines and cancer, including childhood leukemia. Very few studies have shown correlations between adult cancers and proximity to power lines. Several reviews of EMF studies have been conducted by government agencies, including the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences of the National Institutes of Health (NIEHS) and the California Department of Health Sciences (DHS). In general, these reviews have concluded that there is limited evidence linking exposure to EMF and cancer. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) found that childhood leukemia was the only type of cancer for which there could be a link to EMF exposure and that the evidence for that link was limited (DHS 1999).

3.9.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK – APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATIONS, PLANS, AND POLICIES

Numerous federal, state, and local laws and regulations control the generation, storage, handling, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes, as well as site remediation and Brownfield development. Those with particular application to the Proposed Action and the alternatives are detailed below.

3.9.3.1 Federal Laws and Regulations

Generally administered by the U.S. EPA, federal statutes and regulations both set forth federal responsibilities for dealing with hazardous materials and, where appropriate, authorize the U.S. EPA to delegate responsibility to state agencies. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the DOT also regulate handling and transport of hazardous materials and hazardous waste. Applicable federal regulations are contained primarily in Titles 10, 29, 40 and 49 of the code of Federal Regulations (CFR). CFR Title 40 addresses emergency planning and notification, hazardous material management plans, soil and water pollution remediation and reporting, and community right-to-know reporting. Any investigation or cleanup of soil contamination required on the project site or the Alternative 4 site would be subject to the standards set forth in Title 40.

Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976

The Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) (15 USC Sections 2601–2692) authorizes the U.S. EPA to require chemical manufacturers to provide data about their products' effects on human health and on the environment (Sections 2603–2604). TSCA further authorizes the U.S. EPA to regulate their production and use to reduce health or environmental risks (Sections 2604–2605). TSCA also sets forth regulations for lead-based paint abatement, including authorizing regulations for building renovation or demolition to reduce lead exposure (Sections 2682–2688). In addition, TSCA banned the manufacture, processing, distribution, and use of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). PCBs are toxic and carcinogenic and can cause effects on the immune, reproductive, nervous, and endocrine systems of humans and animals. The U.S. EPA Region 9 PCB Program regulates remediation of PCBs in several states, including California. Under Title 40 CFR, Section 761.30(a)(1)(vi)(A), all owners of electrical transformers containing PCBs must register them with the U.S. EPA. Transformers and other items manufactured before July 1, 1978, and containing PCBs must be marked by the owner with a warning notice that the equipment contains PCBs.

Specified electrical equipment manufactured between July 1, 1978, and July 1, 1998, that does not contain PCBs must be marked by the manufacturer with the statement "No PCBs."

Solid Waste Disposal Act and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976

The Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA) (42 USC Sections 6901–6992(k)), which includes as a subsection the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (42 USC sections 6921–6939(e)), creates a "cradle-to-grave" (from manufacture to disposal) regulatory system for hazardous wastes, and delegates substantial authority to the states for waste management under U.S. EPA supervision. RCRA requires the U.S. EPA to adopt criteria for identifying hazardous wastes, to formulate a list of "designated" hazardous wastes, and to set forth standards for facilities that handle them.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 USC sections 9601–9675), which was later amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), sets forth regulations for cleanup of hazardous substances after improper disposal; identifies federal response authority; and outlines responsibilities and liabilities of "potentially responsible parties"— those parties who have control over the hazardous substance itself, the property where hazardous source have been disposed or spilled, the source that it was spilled from, etc. CERCLA also specifies where Superfund money can be used for site cleanup. Notably, CERCLA defines "hazardous substances" by cross-referencing to other environmental statutes. Additionally, U.S. EPA can designate additional substances as hazardous substances.

Hazardous Materials Transportation Regulations

Under RCRA, U.S. EPA regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous substances. The Federal Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986 (US Code Title 42, Chapter 116) imposes hazardous-materials planning requirements to help protect local communities in the event of accidental release of hazardous substances, including releases that may occur during transportation of such materials. U.S. EPA has delegated RCRA authority to the State of California. This authority is administered by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Transportation of hazardous materials along any local or state roadway or rail line is subject to both the transportation safety requirements established in RCRA and the DOT hazardous materials transportation regulations. The DOT Federal Railroad Administration enforces hazardous materials transport regulations, which include requirements that railroads and other transporters of hazardous materials, including shippers, create and adhere to security plans and provide safety and security training to employees involved in handling or transporting hazardous materials.

Pipeline Safety Statutes

The DOT provides oversight for the nation's natural gas pipeline transportation system. Its responsibilities are outlined under Title 49 CFR, Chapter 601. The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials

Safety Administration (PHMSA) Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) administers the national pipeline regulatory program to ensure the safe transportation of gas and other hazardous materials. The Pipeline Safety Statute at Title 49, Chapters 601 and 603 establishes requirements for pipeline construction, operational safety, and risk management. The Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, as amended, authorizes the DOT to regulate pipeline transportation of hazardous liquids. The Pipeline Inspection, Protection, Enforcement, and Safety Act of 2006 established a damage prevention program and additional safety requirements for petroleum, natural gas, and hazardous liquid pipelines. The federal pipeline regulations are published in Title 49 CFR 26, Parts 190 through 199. CFR 192 specifically addresses natural and other gas pipelines. Many of the pipeline regulations are written as performance standards, which set the level of safety to be attained and allow the pipeline operator discretion in the choice of technologies to achieve the required safety level.

3.9.3.2 State Laws and Regulations

The DTSC and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) administer most of California's hazardous waste regulations. The principal California regulations for hazardous materials are in the Government Code: the California Emergency Services Act (California Government Code Sections 8574.1–8574.23), Oil Spill Response and Contingency Planning (Sections 8670.1-8670.73), and the Elder California Pipeline Safety Act of 1981 (Sections 51010–51019.1) as well as in numerous provisions in the Health and Safety Code, such as the Hazardous Waste Control Act (Health and Safety Code Sections 25100–25250.28), the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Sections 25249.5–25249.13), Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List), the California Land Use and Revitalization Act of 2004 (Sections 25395.6–25395.109), the California Land Environmental Restoration and Reuse Act (Sections 25401–25402.3), the Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program (Sections 25404–25404.9), Asbestos and Hazardous Substance Removal Contracts (Sections 25914–25914.3), Asbestos Notification (Sections 25915–25919.7), and Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory (Sections 25500–25546.5). The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Water Code Sections 13000–13953.4) addresses hazardous material discharge into water bodies and groundwater. The following statutes would apply to the Proposed Action and the alternatives.

Hazardous Waste Control Act (HWCA)

The California Hazardous Waste Control Act (HWCA) is the primary state law that regulates hazardous waste and hazardous waste disposal facilities, and is administered by the DTSC. Like the federal RCRA, the HWCA regulates transportation and disposal of hazardous wastes, sets forth hazardous waste facility standards and directs administrative and enforcement procedures. It also lists and categorizes specific hazardous wastes.

Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65)

The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act, commonly referred to by its ballot measure, Proposition 65, prohibits businesses from discharging known carcinogens or reproductive toxins into

sources of drinking water, and requires businesses (such as grocery stores) to warn persons about possible exposure on the business premises to such carcinogens or toxins.

Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program

The Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program, enacted in 1993, enabled a statewide program to consolidate the numerous hazardous waste and materials programs then in existence. It assigns lead responsibility to the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) to certify subsidiary public agencies to administer the program's regulations (Certified Unified Program Agencies [CUPAs]), and enables participating agencies (PAs) to enforce one or more program elements. Notably, the Program requires Cal/EPA to establish a statewide database and geographic information system to collect and make public the data that CUPAs and PAs obtain. Implementing regulations are at 27 CCR Sections 15100–15620. The Roseville Fire Department is the CUPA for the City of Roseville; Placer County's Environmental Health Division is the designated CUPA for unincorporated County areas.

Asbestos-Related Statutes

Health and Safety Code Sections 25914–25914.3 specifies contract conditions for work involving asbestos or other hazardous substance removal, requiring that such removal work be performed by a properly certified contractor. Sections 25915–25919.7 require building owners to notify tenants, construction workers, etc., about the presence of asbestos in buildings constructed before 1979.

Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory

The Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory requires local governments and businesses to adopt plans to respond to releases of hazardous materials and to develop risk management and prevention programs to minimize risks from accidental releases of acutely hazardous materials. Minimum requirements for such plans are in the California Code of Regulations at Title 19, Sections 2720–2732.

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act regulates water quality within the state and implements the federal Water Pollution Control Act, including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) (see discussions under **Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality**). The Regional Water Quality Control Boards exercise primary enforcement authority for waste discharges affecting water quality, including drafting regional water quality plans and issuing permits and cleanup and abatement orders. The boards may also seek judicial relief, including both civil and criminal penalties, against unlawful waste dischargers.

Hazardous Materials Transportation Regulations

Transport of hazardous materials is administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and enforced by the California Highway Patrol (CHP). These agencies have established regulations on container types used and license hazardous waste haulers for transportation of hazardous

waste on public roads. Hazardous waste transporters must be registered with the DTSC. Hazardous waste transporters must comply with CHP regulations and California State Fire Marshal regulations, as well as federal DOT regulations. In addition, hazardous waste transporters must comply with Division 20, Chapter 6.5, Article 6 and 13 of the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 13, of the California Code of Regulations, which are administered by the DTSC.

California Education Code

The California Education Code (Section 17210 et seq.) outlines the requirements for location of school facilities near or on suspected hazardous materials sites or near facilities that emit hazardous air emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. The Code requires that an environmental site investigation be completed to determine whether there are health and safety risks associated with a potential new school site prior to commencing the acquisition of the property. All proposed school sites that will receive state funding for acquisition or construction must go through a comprehensive investigation and cleanup process (if necessary) under DTSC oversight. The DTSC is responsible for assessment, investigation, and remediation of proposed school sites. Among other requirements, school districts must contract for the preparation of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prior to acquiring a school site or engaging in a construction project and the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment must be reviewed by the DTSC according to established guidelines.

School Locations Relative to Sources of Hazardous Emissions

Public Resources Code Sections 21151.4, 21151.8, and 21151.2 require that no EIR be approved for a project involving construction or alteration of a facility that might reasonably be anticipated to result in hazardous air emissions within one-quarter mile (0.4 kilometer) of a school unless the lead agency has consulted with the relevant school district regarding the potential impact of the project on the school, or the school has been given written notification of the project not less than 30 days prior to approval of the EIR. New schools are required to be set back one-quarter mile (0.4 kilometer) from high-pressure gas lines.

School Locations Relative to Electrical Transmission Sources

The California Department of Education School Facilities Planning Division has developed specific guidelines that address the location of schools relative to electrical transmission lines. Any part of the school site must be at least 100 feet (30.5 meters) from the edge of an easement for a 50 to 133 kV line, and at least 150 feet (45.7 meters) from the edge of an easement for a 230 kV line.

Recycled Water Use Regulations

Wastewater treatment plant effluent that has received treatment that meets certain state requirements may be recycled and used for direct non-potable uses such as landscape irrigation or industrial cooling. Treatment requirements are set forth in CCR Title 22, Section 60301 et seq. Section 60301.230 specifies the requirements for recycled water. DHS considers properly filtered and disinfected water meeting its water quality standards to be essentially pathogen-free and adequately protective of public health. Water

meeting these standards may be used for unrestricted use, including but not limited to body contact for recreation (swimming), irrigation of food crops, and irrigation of parks, play grounds, and school yards.

Prior to allowing the use of recycled water for irrigation on the project site, the County would be required to prepare an Engineering Report in accordance with Title 22 of the CCR. The report must be submitted to and reviewed by DHS. DHS also requires that recycled water must be conveyed in a separate distribution system isolated from the potable water supply. Areas where recycled water is used for irrigation must be maintained by professional landscape maintenance contractors and local agency maintenance staff. Placer County would be required to implement a cross-connection control program to ensure that potable water lines are not accidentally connected to the recycled water system and would also be required to implement a public education program (including signage) to notify the public of the use and location of non-potable water application. Section 60301 of the regulations establishes specific use area requirements that address separation of application areas from domestic supply wells and runoff control.

3.9.3.3 Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances

Placer County General Plan

The following are applicable goals and policies from the Placer County General Plan:

Policy 8.G.1. The County shall ensure that the use and disposal of hazardous materials in the County complies with local, state, and federal safety standards.

Policy 8.G.2. The County shall discourage the development of residences or schools near known hazardous waste disposal or handling facilities.

Policy 8.G.3. The County shall review all proposed development projects that manufacture, use, or transport hazardous materials for compliance with the County's Hazardous Waste Management Plan (CHWMP).

Policy 8.G.5. The County shall strictly regulate the storage of hazardous materials and wastes.

Policy 8.G.6. The County shall require secondary containment and periodic examination for all storage of toxic materials.

Policy 8.G.7. The County shall ensure that industrial facilities are constructed and operated in accordance with current safety and environmental protection standards.

Policy 8.G.8. The County shall require that new industries that store and process hazardous materials provide a buffer zone between the installation and the property boundaries sufficient to protect

public safety. The adequacy of the buffer zone shall be determined by the County.

Policy 8.G.9. The County shall require that applications for discretionary development projects that will generate hazardous wastes or use hazardous materials include detailed information on hazardous waste reduction, recycling, and storage.

Policy 8.G.10. The County shall require that any business that handles a hazardous material prepare a plan for emergency response to a release or threatened release of a hazardous material.

Policy 8.G.11. The County shall encourage the State Department of Health Services and the California Highway Patrol to review permits for radioactive materials on a regular basis and to promulgate and enforce public safety standards for the use of these materials, including the placarding of transport vehicles.

Policy 8.G.12. The County shall identify sites that are inappropriate for hazardous material storage, maintenance, use, and disposal facilities due to potential impacts on adjacent land uses and the surrounding natural environment.

Policy 8.G.13. The County shall work with local fire protection and other agencies to ensure an adequate countywide response capability to hazardous materials emergencies.

To ensure the implementation of the stated policies, the General Plan directs that the County shall maintain and implement a CHWMP that addresses: hazardous waste generators; emergency response programs; transportation, storage, collection, treatment, and disposal of hazardous wastes generated within Placer County; the siting of hazardous waste facilities; and enforcement activities. The General Plan also states that the County shall prepare and maintain a Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan.

Agency Databases

The U.S. EPA maintains two databases: the National Priorities List (NPL) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) list. NPL is the list of sites identified by the U.S. EPA for priority cleanup under the Superfund Program. The CERCLIS list is a list of sites which are or have been investigated by the U.S. EPA for a release or threatened release of hazardous substances. None of the parcels covered by the project site is on the NPL or CERCLIS list.

Under RCRA, the U.S. EPA maintains a list of facilities that generate, store, transport, treat, or dispose of hazardous wastes. None of the parcels covered by the project site is on the RCRA list.

The State of California maintains several databases of sites having hazardous materials storage, generation, disposal, or contamination. As part of the Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments performed on the project site parcels, available federal, state, and local agency databases were reviewed to identify the presence of any government-regulated properties, either on or adjacent to the project site, that could potentially result in hazardous on-site conditions. The review included the databases of the DTSC, California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and the California Office of Environmental Protection. The project site is not included on any of the state databases.

Placer County maintains a database of hazardous waste generators in the County. The project site is not included on this database.

3.9.4 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

3.9.3.1 Significance Thresholds

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations require an evaluation of the degree to which the proposed action could affect public health or safety. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has determined that the Proposed Action or its alternatives would result in substantial adverse effects related to hazards and hazardous materials if the Proposed Action or an alternative would:

- Result in exposure of construction workers or the public to contaminated soil or groundwater;
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or
- Expose the public to a public safety hazard.

3.9.3.2 Analysis Methodology

Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials were evaluated qualitatively, based on the general types of hazardous materials and techniques that are likely to be used during construction and operation of the Proposed Action and alternatives. The analysis in this section focuses on the use, generation, disposal, transport, risk of upset, or management of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials on the project site; the potential risks associated with a planned adjacent natural gas pipeline; the potential risks associated with the presence of electrical transmission lines; and the potential risks associated with use of recycled water for landscape irrigation. The analysis assumes that the construction and operation of development under the Proposed Action or the alternatives would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, including the General Plan policies and implementation measures described in **Subsection 3.8.3** above.

3.9.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact HAZ-1 Exposure to soil or groundwater contamination from past uses

No Action Alt. The No Action Alternative would develop a smaller portion of the project site as it would avoid areas where jurisdictional wetlands are present. Therefore, under this alternative, the potential to encounter soil and groundwater conditions would be lower as compared to the Proposed Action which is described below. As described in

Subsection 3.9.2, above, USTs were identified on Property #4 and low levels of contamination were identified on Properties #4, #10, #11, and #15. Construction in portions of Properties #4, #10, and #15 under the No Action Alternative could encounter contaminated soil and groundwater. The No Action Alternative would not develop Property #11. There is a potential for **significant** effects related to these conditions to occur. **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-1, 4.12-6a** and **6b, 4.12-7a** and **7b, 4.12-8, 4.12-9, 4.12-13,** and **4.12-17** would address these effects. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this impact. The County concluded that these mitigation measures would fully mitigate impacts to less than significant. The USACE also finds that the effect would be **less than significant** with mitigation.

Proposed Action, Alts. 1 through 5

Construction workers or the public could be exposed to contaminated soil, groundwater, or building materials. With the implementation of **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-1, 4.12-6a** and **6b, 4.12-7a** and **7b, 4.12-8, 4.12-9, 4.12-13,** and **4.12-17,** the effect would be mitigated to a **less than significant** level**.**

The project site contains some properties where soil and groundwater may be contaminated from previous uses. As described in **Subsection 3.9.2**, above, two USTs were identified on Property #4 during the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment. Samples from Properties #4, #10, #11, and #15 identified relatively low concentrations (below regulatory cleanup thresholds) of motor oil, grease, diesel fuel, and lead. Samples from Property #15 identified motor oil, oil and grease, and/or diesel fuel concentrations likely above the level of concern or regulatory cleanup threshold. Construction in portions of Properties #4, #10, #11, and #15 could encounter contaminated soil and groundwater.

In addition, existing structures present on the site could contain hazardous building materials such as lead based paint and asbestos and septic systems present on some of the properties could also be a source of contamination. The presence of existing homes and evidence of previously existing dwellings on the project site indicates that septic systems consisting of septic tanks and disposal fields or dry wells, or cesspools, have been used to dispose of domestic wastewater on the project site. Septic systems may have been used to dispose of hazardous materials, including petroleum hydrocarbon products and wastes. Materials disposed of in septic systems may enter subsurface disposal trenches or dry wells, and thereby impact the subsurface soils or groundwater.

Unused wells also pose a health hazard by providing a conduit for contaminants released during project construction and operation to reach a potable water supply. Four unused wells with pumps installed were observed on Properties #9 and #10, and abandoned open irrigation wells were located during the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment on Properties #4 and #11. While the wells do not present a physical hazard in their current condition, they would need to be properly destroyed prior to project

development.

Portions of the project site have been or are in active agricultural use. Some agricultural chemicals have the potential to occur in the soils on the project site as some of these chemicals are known to persist in near-surface soils, depending on the concentrations and types used. Prior to the regulation of environmentally persistent chemicals, chlorinated pesticides such as DDT were used extensively, especially during the 1940s and 1950s, as a commercial pesticide and were likely used on the orchards and vineyards reported to have existed on the project site.

Construction of the Proposed Action or Alternatives 1 through 5 could result in **significant** effects related to exposure to contaminated soil or groundwater or building materials associated with the sources described above. **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-1, 4.12-6a** and **6b, 4.12-7a** and **7b, 4.12-8, 4.12-9, 4.12-13,** and **4.12-17** would address the effect related to exposure to soil and groundwater contamination from past uses. These mitigation measures require the preparation of a Phase II site assessment if a current Phase I site assessment is not available for any development site (residential subdivision or industrial/commercial site) at the time that the development is proposed and the implementation of the recommendations of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. The measures also require: a site-specific evaluation by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II at each identified existing and former dwelling area to identify surface indications and locations of septic tanks or cesspools prior to demolition of existing residences, and implementation of any required remediation work in accordance with state and County regulations; the removal of USTs and remediation if necessary consistent with state and County regulations; additional sampling to be performed on Properties #10, 11, and 15 if regulatory clean-up thresholds are exceeded, with follow-up remediation to meet state and County regulations; and destruction of all wells according to state and County requirements.

These mitigation measures were adopted by Placer County for the Proposed Action (Base Plan) at the time of project approval and will be enforced by the County. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario and Alternatives 1 through 5 to address this impact. The PVSP EIR determined that **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-1, 4.12-6a** and **6b, 4.12-7a** and **7b, 4.12-8, 4.12-9, 4.12-13,** and **4.12-17** would ensure that impacts from exposure to soil and groundwater contamination would be **less than significant**. The USACE also finds that the impact would be **less than significant** after mitigation.

The California Education Code requires site-specific information for school site development, including approval from DTSC that the proposed school sites are free of contaminants that would pose a risk to students and faculty. Center Joint Unified School District would be required under the California Education Code to complete the necessary assessments to ensure that development of the proposed school sites would

not expose children and teachers to risks associated with contaminated sites.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-1: Underground Storage Tank Removal and Remediation (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-1 requires the removal of USTs and remediation if necessary consistent with State and County regulations. The full mitigation measure text is available in ***Appendix 3.0****.*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-3: Destruction of Wells (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-3 requires destruction of all wells according to state and County requirements. The full mitigation measure text is available in ***Appendix 3.0****.*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-6a-b, PVSP Mitigation Measures 4.12-7a-b, PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.12-8, and **PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.12-9: Additional Soil Sampling (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-6a-b, PVSP Mitigation Measures 4.12-7a-b, PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.12-8, and PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.12-9 require additional sampling to be performed on Properties #10, 11, and 15 if regulatory clean-up thresholds are exceeded, with follow-up remediation to meet State and County regulations. The full mitigation measure text is available in ***Appendix 3.0****.*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-13: Identify and Remediate Septic Systems (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-13 requires a site-specific evaluation by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II at each identified existing and former dwelling area to identify surface indications and locations of septic tanks or cesspools prior to demolition of existing residences, and implementation of any required remediation work in accordance with State and County regulations. The full mitigation measure text is available in ***Appendix 3.0.***

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-17: Identify and Remediate Potential Hazardous Contamination (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-17 requires the preparation of a Phase I site assessment if a current Phase I site assessment is not available for any development site (residential subdivision or industrial/commercial site) at the time that the development is proposed. The full mitigation measure text is available in ***Appendix 3.0****.*

Impact HAZ-2 Hazards from Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials or Wastes

No Action Alt., Proposed The effects from accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during construction, project operation, or hazardous materials transportation, would be **less than significant**

Action, Alts. 1 through 5

for the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5.

Construction

The routine use of hazardous substances during construction that is in compliance with federal law would not result in adverse effects on human health or the environment.

Construction typically involves the use of hazardous materials such as petroleum products, coatings (paint), and cleaning chemicals, and may generate hazardous wastes through use of such materials. Construction workers could be exposed to hazardous materials through improper handling or use of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes during construction of the project, particularly by untrained personnel; transportation accident; unsound disposal methods; or fire, explosion or other emergencies. As discussed in **Subsection 3.8.3**, above, construction activities on-site would be subject to federal and state hazardous materials regulations and worker safety regulations regarding handling of and exposure to hazardous materials. These regulations must be implemented by employers and are enforced by the state. In addition, all construction projects involving 1 acre (0.4 hectare) or more of ground disturbance are subject to NPDES requirements of developing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan to prevent construction pollutants from contacting storm water and entering into storm sewer systems and other jurisdictional waters. All dischargers must obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ adopted on September 2, 2009, which is substantially more stringent than the previous general permit. These effects would be less than significant. Therefore, mitigation is not required.

Project Operation

Compliance with state and federal laws would avoid adverse effects associated with hazardous material use and storage.

Once the project site is developed, residential and commercial uses would involve use and storage of hazardous materials. These materials likely would include household products such as cleaning agents, solvent, paint, oils, pesticides, etc. These products are commercially available for public use and are typically sold with warning labels and use/storage recommendations from the manufacturers. These materials are typically used or stored in residences in small quantities. Such uses of hazardous materials do not generate hazardous air emissions and rarely, if ever, involve the use of acutely hazardous materials that could pose a significant threat to the environment or human health.

Depending on the type of commercial development that occurs, use and storage of larger quantities of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous waste could occur. For example, development could include warehouse-type building supply stores that would stock products such as paint, lubricants, cleaning products, printing ink, pool treatment chemicals, and other hazardous materials. Building maintenance operations, as well as

businesses such as auto repair, gas stations, and medical offices would generate hazardous wastes. Commercial use and storage of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes would be subject to federal, state, and local regulations. As discussed in **Subsection 3.8.3**, above, hazardous materials regulations have been established at the state level to ensure compliance with federal regulations to reduce the risk to human health and the environment from the routine handling, use, and storage of hazardous materials. These regulations must be implemented by employers and businesses and are enforced by the state (Cal OSHA in the workplace or DTSC for hazardous waste) and local jurisdictions (Placer County Fire Department). The Placer County Certified Unified Program Agency is the local agency responsible for implementation of the Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program. Compliance with the Unified Program would reduce the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials during occupancy of the project site and would avoid or reduce adverse effects associated with such use. The Unified Program is intended to ensure that regulated activities (businesses) within the project site are managed in accordance with applicable regulations, including the Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventories (Business Plan), the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program, and the California Fire Code. These effects would be less than significant. Mitigation is not required.

Hazardous Materials Transportation

Construction and operation of development under the all of the alternatives would involve transport of hazardous materials, potentially including large quantities of construction and maintenance supplies containing hazardous materials. However, compliance with applicable regulations would reduce or avoid the risk of adverse effects related to transport of hazardous materials. All transport would be required to comply with federal and state regulations, as administered by Caltrans and enforced by the CHP. Implementation of the transportation regulations in Title 49 CFR would reduce the potential for accidental release during construction or occupancy by transporters delivering hazardous materials to the project site or picking up hazardous waste. These effects would be less than significant. Mitigation is not required.

In summary, with compliance with applicable regulations, the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 would result in a **less than significant** effect related to the handling, storage, and transport of hazardous materials.

Impact HAZ-3 Hazard Associated with Adjacent Natural Gas Pipeline

No Action Alt. Effects to the residents and employees on the project site from the rupture of the natural gas pipeline are expected to be **less than significant**.

Construction of the planned PG&E Line 407-E natural gas pipeline along the northern side of Baseline Road is anticipated to take place in 2012. Based on this schedule, the natural gas pipeline would be present near the northern boundary of the project site when development of the Proposed Action commences. The implementation of the Proposed Action would have the potential to expose residents and employees on the project site to risk associated with the natural gas pipeline.

As described in the 2009 PG&E Line 406/407 Final EIR (PG&E Line Final EIR), the planned Line 407-E, a 30-inch (76.2 centimeters) diameter natural gas pipeline, would be designed to meet current regulatory standards for safety. Proper design, construction, and maintenance of the planned pipeline would be required and would minimize leaks. The pipeline would be buried along its entire length at a minimum depth of approximately 5 feet (1.5 meters), including the segment north of the project site. A 50-foot (15.24 meter) easement would be placed along the length of the pipeline where no developed uses would be allowed (SLC 2009).

Under the No Action Alternative, low-density residential uses would be located near the natural gas pipeline easement on Baseline Road in the northeast corner of the site. All of the proposed schools, including the high school, would be located more than 0.25 mile (0.4 kilometer) from the pipeline under this alternative; this distance is consistent with California Department of Education Standards, which require a minimum separation of 0.25 mile (0.4 kilometer) from natural gas pipelines.

Based on the risk assessment included in the PG&E Line Final EIR, the planned pipeline would not pose a significant risk from rupture to nearby populated areas. The assessment used the threshold used by the California Department of Education as a part of their school siting criteria. This is a threshold for unacceptable individual risk and is expressed as an annual likelihood of a one in a million (1:1,000,000) chance of fatality as a result of an accident involving the natural gas pipeline. The risk assessment included calculation of risks before and after implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. Two analysis approaches, a simplified approach and an enhanced approach intended to present a "worst-case" scenario, were presented for both pre- and post-mitigation conditions. Based on the assessment, the maximum individual risk posed by Line 407 (both east and west segments) before mitigation is 1:2,062,000, and after mitigation it is 1:4,115,000 chance of fatality per year. Because the calculated individual risk is well below the threshold of 1:1,000,000, the Final EIR concluded that the risk was less than significant (SLC 2009). Although the risk was considered less than significant, the EIR included mitigation measures to further reduce the risk of rupture. These include use of recently manufactured pipe, post-construction surveys and periodic inspections, and implementation of an Emergency Response Plan that would be coordinated and tested (through drills and exercises) with local fire and police departments and emergency management agencies (SLC 2009). Based on the information presented above,

effects associated with the proximity of the natural gas pipeline would be **less than significant** for the nearest low-density residential uses under the No Action Alternative. Mitigation is not required.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alts. 1 through 5

Under the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5, the predominant proposed land uses along Baseline Road are commercial and open space. These uses are generally considered compatible with the gas pipeline. Low-density residential uses would be located south of the natural gas pipeline easement along approximately 2,000 feet (609 meters) of Baseline Road in the northeast corner of the project site, and the proposed high school would be located adjacent to Baseline Road under the Proposed Action Base Plan and Blueprint scenarios and Alternatives 1 through 5. As shown in **Figures 2.0-2** and **2.0-3**, all of the other schools would be set back over 0.25 mile from (0.4 kilometer) the pipeline easement. Although the high school site is located adjacent to Baseline Road, the pipeline alignment in that area deviates from the roadway and has been placed more than 0.25 mile (0.4 kilometer) to the north of the roadway to provide the required setback from the high school. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented for the No Action Alternative, effects associated with the proximity of the natural gas pipeline would be **less than significant.**

Impact HAZ-4 Risk related to Use of Recycled Water

No Action Alt, Proposed Action, Alts. 1 through 5

The use of recycled water would not result in any conditions that would unduly expose future occupants to human health risks. The effect would be **less than significant.**

As described in **Section 2.0, Proposed Action and Alternatives**, development under the all of the alternatives would have recycled water provisions for use in parks, schools, publicly landscaped areas, and the landscaping associated with commercial, business professional, light industrial, and multi-family uses. It is anticipated that recycled water would be delivered from the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (DCWWTP), and ultimately the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP). Recycled water would only be available to the project if the wastewater from the project site is treated at the DCWWTP and PGWWTP. Use of recycled water is not anticipated under the second option for wastewater treatment at the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) because it would not be practicable to convey recycled water to the project site from that location.

Individuals using or maintaining the parks and landscaped facilities would have skin contact with recycled water when these features are actively irrigated, for example by touching irrigated grass or runoff. The PGWWTP is designed and operated to produce effluent that meets or exceeds standards consistent with "Disinfected Tertiary Recycled Water" as defined by Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Any recycled water

to be used on site would therefore meet state regulatory standards, as outlined in **Subsection 3.8.3**, above. Water meeting these standards may be used for unrestricted use, including recreation involving body contact, irrigation of food crops, and irrigation of parks, playgrounds, and schoolyards. Placer County would be responsible for ensuring that the irrigation sites comply with the use requirements established in Section 60310 of the CCR. As described in **Subsection 3.8.3**, above, cross-connection controls would ensure that recycled water does not enter the potable water distribution system. The use of recycled water on the project site is anticipated to be a **less than significant** effect. Mitigation is not required.

Impact HAZ-5 Risk of Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Transmission Lines

No Action Alt., Proposed Action, Alts. 1 through 5

The No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 would have **less than significant** effects associated with increased exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMF).

As discussed above, the project site is crossed by high-voltage electric transmission and distribution lines that are owned by the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), and Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). Transmission lines on-site range in size from 115 kilovolts (kV) to 230 kV. Development of the project site would increase the number of people who would be exposed to potential risks associated with EMF produced by these lines. The three power line easement corridors are primarily designated open space under the Specific Plan for the project site, which restricts intensive forms of development immediately adjacent to or under the power lines. Public uses within the transmission corridors would be limited to transient recreational activities such as use of undeveloped nature areas and trails or community commercial uses that would not include residences. Low-voltage transmission lines serving residential and commercial areas within the project site would be placed underground.

Residential uses are proposed adjacent to but not within the transmission line corridors; residential areas would be a minimum of 100 feet (30.5 meters) from the corridor. Implementation of appropriate setbacks from the corridor would ensure that effects associated with increased exposure to EMF would be minimal.

The California Education Code requires a minimum setback of 150 feet (15.25 meters) from 230-kV transmission corridors, and the Center Joint Unified School District has requested a minimum setback of 400 feet (122 meters) from the WAPA corridor. As shown on **Figures 2.0-2, 2.0-3,** and **2.0-9**, all schools are set back a minimum of 400 feet (122 meters) from the WAPA corridor. No schools are planned near the other two

transmission corridors. Less than significant EMF effects to schools from the project site transmission corridor are anticipated. Mitigation is not necessary.

The substation proposed as part of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 would be located at least 50 feet (15.25 meters) from the nearest regularly occupied residential structures, and the distance from the proposed substation would limit exposure to EMF. PG&E would prepare an EMF Field Management Plan that will delineate no-cost and low-cost EMF reduction measures to be installed as part of the final engineering design for the substation. The effect would be **less than significant.** Mitigation is not required.

Impact HAZ-6 Indirect Effects Associated with Hazards and Hazardous Materials from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project

No Action Alt., Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), and Alts. 1 through 5

The construction and operation of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) which would be used by No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5, would result in **less than significant** effects associated with hazards and hazardous materials with implementation of mitigation.

The pipelines would convey potable water to the project site and other nearby areas which even if damaged, would not represent a hazard to residents near the pipeline route.

As analyzed in the PVSP Second Partially Recirculated RDEIR dated March 2007, construction of the water pipelines may subject construction workers to hazardous materials such as petroleum products, underground storage tanks (USTs), contaminated soils, refuse, abandoned wells, septic systems, and structures containing asbestos. Construction activities would be subject to federal and state hazardous materials regulations and worker safety regulations regarding handling of and exposure to hazardous materials, as described above. In addition, the infrastructure project would be required to comply with NPDES requirements, including submission of a SWPP.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-21a through **4.12-21f** were adopted by Placer County at the time of project approval of the PVSP (Off-site improvements associated with the Proposed Action). The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measure on the off-site improvements associated with the Proposed Action, No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 through 5 to address this effect. **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-21a** through **4.12-21f** identifies the appropriate methods to handle any USTs, asbestos contamination, wells, or auto parts, debris, household waste and similar materials, if encountered. The Placer Vineyards Specific Plan EIR

identified that these mitigation measures to reduce the effects associated with hazards and hazardous materials from off-site infrastructure to a less than significant level (Placer County 2006). However, in the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the PVSP EIR, the County acknowledged that it did not have the authority to impose these mitigation measures on PCWA's project and the impact would remain significant. USACE concurs with the County that if the PCWA imposes these or similar mitigation measures on the infrastructure project, the effects associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant. However, USACE also does not have the authority to impose mitigation measures on a project that would be built by the PCWA and finds that the effects would remain **significant**.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-21a through
PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-21f: **Hazards and Hazardous Materials (*Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-21a-f *identify the appropriate methods to be used by the applicant if any USTs, asbestos contamination, wells, or auto parts, debris, household waste and similar materials are encountered. The full mitigation measure text is available in* ***Appendix 3.0.***

3.9.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

All effects associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be mitigated by the proposed mitigation measures. There would be no residual significant impacts for the Proposed Action and any of the alternatives.

3.9.7 REFERENCES

California Department of Health Services (DHS), California Electric and Magnetic Fields Program. 1999. Short Factsheet on EMF.

California State Lands Commission. 2009. "PG&E Line 406/407 Natural Gas Pipeline EIR prepared by the Michael Brandman Associates."

Carlton Engineering, Inc. 2000. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Placer Vineyards, Placer County, California."

Carlton Engineering, Inc. 2001. "Placer Vineyards Specific Plan EIR, Placer County, California, Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Sampling and Focused Site Reconnaissance."

Placer County. 2006. "Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report" (State Clearinghouse No. 1999062020).

Placer County. 1994. "Placer County General Plan Update."