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 regulations 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:

- Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville;
- Westbrook Specific Plan Amendment Initial Study, prepared by the City of Roseville;
- *EMF Frequently Asked Questions*, by Pacific Gas and Electric Company;
- *EMF Questions and Answers,* by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences; and
- *Short Factsheet on EMF*, by the California Department of Health Services (CDHS).

A number of Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESA) were performed on the parcels that make up the project site prior to preparation of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR and the Westbrook Specific Plan Amendment Initial Study. Information from those ESAs was also used in this section.

3.9.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

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 (USEPA), the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Each agency has its own definition of a "hazardous material."

USEPA and EPCRA (The Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act) 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 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, 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.

Activities on the project site that could expose the public to hazardous materials or wastes during project development and operation include improper handling or use of hazardous materials during the course of business; failure of storage containment systems; fire, explosion, or other emergencies; unsound disposal or treatment methods; accidents during transport; or exposure to contaminated soil or groundwater (for example, during excavation and grading).

3.9.2.1 Past and Current Conditions on the Project Site

The project site consists primarily of rolling, open annual grassland areas, with a seasonal creek traversing the northwestern corner of the project site. Most of the land area is used for grazing livestock. The only built features on the project site are seven utility poles supporting power lines that cross the site in a north-south direction along the proposed alignment of Westbrook Boulevard.

Hazardous Materials and Waste

The site has been used primarily for grazing, which does not typically involve the use of pesticides, herbicides, or other potentially hazardous materials. Reviews of historic photographs of the site showed that the project area was historically undeveloped grassland and dry-farmed or grazing land. No

evidence was found of intense agricultural use or the presence of aboveground storage tanks or underground storage tanks (USTs), oil/water separators, or agricultural chemical mixing facilities. Current and previous potential sources of hazardous materials within the project site include debris from past uses or dumping on the site.

Hazardous Materials Transportation

Hazardous materials are routinely transported by truck and by rail in the project site vicinity. The California Vehicle Code and DOT regulations generally prohibit transportation of hazardous materials through residential neighborhoods, although local deliveries are allowed. These regulations also require that hazardous materials be transported via routes with the least overall travel time. The City of Roseville Public Works Department has designated truck routes for hazardous materials transport to provide access to light industrial and industrial facilities in the City. These routes include Blue Oaks Boulevard, west from State Route (SR) 65, and Baseline Road, west of Foothills Boulevard. Hazardous materials may also be transported on SR 65 and by the Union Pacific Railroad line, which is located approximately 5 miles (8 kilometers) east of the project site.

3.9.2.2 Alternative Site

The alternative site is located approximately 3 miles (4.8 kilometers) to the northeast of the project site in unincorporated Placer County. The majority of the site is outside of the 1-mile (1.6 kilometer) County-defined Western Regional Landfill buffer area and is located west of light industrial uses along Industrial Avenue. This site had previously been proposed for development, but the previously proposed project has been on hold since early 2008 and is no longer being pursued, as discussed in **Section 2.0**. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the site would be annexed into the City of Roseville prior to development.

The site consists mainly of open land. A peaking power plant owned by Roseville Electric, which is run when there is high demand for electricity, is located near the southeast corner of the alternative site. A high-tension electrical transmission line passes in a northwest-southeast direction across the site near the peaking power plant. Based on its current uses, conditions are likely to be broadly similar to those of the project site. Review of aerial photographs shows that the peaking plant has been present and the remainder of the alternative site has been vacant or used for grazing for at least 20 years. A governmental database search indicated that there are no known hazardous materials sites on the alternative site (EDR 2012).

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, Regulations, Plans, and Policies

Generally administered by the USEPA, federal statutes and regulations both set forth federal responsibilities for dealing with hazardous materials and, where appropriate, authorize the USEPA 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 Off-Site Alternative 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 USEPA 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 USEPA 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, carcinogenic, and can cause effects on the immune, reproductive, nervous, and endocrine systems of humans and animals. The USEPA 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 USEPA. Transformers and other items manufactured before July 1, 1978 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 USEPA supervision. RCRA requires the USEPA 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, who are past/present owners or operators of the site, a person who arranged disposal of hazardous substances at a site, or a person who transported hazardous substances to a site they selected for disposal. CERCLA also specifies where Superfund money can be used for site cleanup. Notably, CERCLA cross-references other statutes for hazardous material definition, but permits the USEPA to add materials as their hazardous properties become known.

Hazardous Materials Transportation Regulations

Under RCRA, the USEPA regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes. The Federal Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986 (U.S. 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. The USEPA has delegated RCRA authority to the State of California. This authority is administered by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Transportation of certain hazardous wastes or 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.

3.9.3.2 State Laws, Regulations, Plans, and Policies

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

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.

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, 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 Impact Assessment prior to acquiring a school site or engaging in a construction project and the Phase I Environmental Impact Assessment must be reviewed by the DTSC according to established guidelines.

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 City 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. The City of Roseville 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

Roseville Municipal Code

Chapter 9.60 of the Roseville Municipal Code establishes City regulations for the identification and disclosure of hazardous materials use and management in the City. The Code requires any person who uses or handles a hazardous material to submit a disclosure form annually to the fire chief. The fire department also works with the Placer County Department of Environmental Health in matters regarding hazardous materials management.

Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan

The Roseville Fire Department has developed a Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan that addresses organizational and operation responsibilities in the event of a hazardous materials emergency, including clean up and decontamination procedures. The fire department can also request mutual aid services from the Placer County, City of Sacramento, and Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District Hazardous Materials Response Teams in the event of a large-scale incident. The fire department also provides assistance to the CHP, Office of Emergency Services, and other responding agencies when requested in case of a hazardous materials spill on SR 65 or Interstate 80. The fire department updates its Emergency Response Plan every three years. The plan is an extension of the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan and follows nationally adopted Incident Command System guidelines.

Roseville General Plan

Table 3.9-1, General Plan Safety Element Policies, summarizes the current City General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures relevant to hazards and hazardous materials.

Table 3.9-1
General Plan Safety Element Policies

Hazardous Material Goal: Protect the community's health, safety, natural resources, and property through regulation of use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials.	
Policy	**Implementation Measures**
1. Require the disclosure of the use and storage of hazardous materials in existing and proposed industrial and commercial activities and siting of hazardous waste disposal facilities in accordance with Placer County guidelines and state law.	• Hazardous Materials Listing • Development Review Process • Hazardous Waste Management Plan
2. Work with Placer County and other public agencies to inform consumers about household use and disposal of hazardous materials.	• Inter-governmental Coordination • Hazardous Waste Pickup • Hazardous Materials Data Base
3. Cooperate fully with both public and private agencies, as defined in the City of Roseville Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan in the event of a hazardous materials emergency.	• Interagency Cooperation
4. Develop a hazardous materials truck route through the City of Roseville and limit pickup and delivery of hazardous materials during peak traffic hours.	• Hazardous Materials Truck Route
Electro-magnetic Fields Goal: Protect the community's health, safety, natural resources, and property through regulation of use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials.	
1. Ensure implementation of the Electric Department's policy of "prudent action" with respect to EMF issues.	• EMF Plan
2. Limit public use within electrical power line easements to parking and low-density recreational activities such as undeveloped nature areas, bicycle, or jogging paths.	• Development Review Process • Specific Plans

Source: City of Roseville 2010b

3.9.3.4 Agency Databases

The USEPA maintains two databases: the National Priorities List (NPL) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) list. The NPL is the list of sites identified by the USEPA for priority cleanup under the Superfund Program. The CERCLIS list is a list of sites that are or have been investigated by the USEPA for a release or threatened release of hazardous substances. None of the parcels that make up the project site or the Off-Site Alternative site are on the NPL or CERCLIS list.

Under RCRA, the USEPA maintains a list of facilities that generate, store, transport, treat, or dispose of hazardous wastes. None of the parcels that make up the project site or the Off-Site Alternative site are 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 Environmental Impact 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. Neither the project site nor the Off-Site Alternative site is included on any state databases.

Placer County maintains a database of hazardous waste generators in the County. The project site and the Off-Site Alternative site are not included on this database.

3.9.4 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

3.9.4.1 Significance Thresholds

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) does not specify significance thresholds that may be used to evaluate the effects of a proposed action on hazards and hazardous materials. However, 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 significant 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 routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; or
- expose people to a public safety hazard.

3.9.4.2 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; 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 3.9.3** above.

3.9.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

No Action Alt. As discussed in the **Affected Environment** section above, no known soil or groundwater contamination was identified on the site during site investigations. Nevertheless, construction of the No Action Alternative on the project site could encounter contaminated soil and groundwater due to past agricultural activities which would be a hazard to construction workers and could result in **significant direct** and **indirect** effects

related to exposure to contaminated soil or groundwater. Mitigation is proposed which would reduce these **direct** and **indirect** effects to **less than significant**. In addition, adherence to California Education Code requirements, which is required by law, and would be part of the No-Action Alternative, would ensure that the development of the proposed school site would not expose children and teachers to risks associated with contaminated sites. This **indirect** effect is considered **less than significant**. No mitigation is required.

In general, there is a low potential for soil-disturbing activities to expose workers to contaminated debris or soil or to release hazardous substances during ground-disturbing activities. No structures are present within the project site and it is assumed that grassland and dry farmed sites were treated with little or no agricultural chemicals. However, grading and excavation, for example, could generate airborne dust, resulting in aerial distribution of contamination. Soil containing elevated levels of contaminants, if left unmanaged, could create health risks to project occupants, although the risk appears low based on available information. Based on this information, construction of the No Action Alternative could result in **significant direct** and **indirect** effects related to exposure to contaminated soil or groundwater.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would require the Applicant to implement measures to reduce the risk of exposure to site contamination, including soil and groundwater testing where appropriate, and remediation if necessary. This measure is the same as WMM 4.9-2 in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR (which is adapted from Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 in the certified West Roseville Specific Plan EIR) and was adopted by the City of Roseville at the time of project approval. The USACE assumes that the City of Roseville would impose the same mitigation measure on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. By ensuring that potentially hazardous site conditions are identified and appropriately managed in accordance with regulations adopted prior to development, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR determined that this mitigation measure would reduce the effect to less than significant (City of Roseville 2010a). The USACE also finds that this would be reduced to a **less than significant direct** and **indirect** effect.

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. An elementary school site has been designated in the land use plan for the No Action Alternative. 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 site would not expose children and teachers to risks associated with contaminated sites. This is considered a **less than significant indirect** effect. No mitigation is required.

Proposed Action, Alts. 1 through 5

The Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5 would construct a moderate-scale, mixed-use development on the project site similar to the No Action Alternative. Since soil and groundwater conditions would be similar for all on-site alternatives, there is a potential for **significant direct** and **indirect** effects related to these conditions to occur based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would address these effects. As noted above, this measure is the same as WMM 4.9-2 in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR and is a part of the Proposed Action. The USACE assumes that the City of Roseville would impose the same mitigation measure on the on-site alternatives to address this effect. By ensuring that potentially hazardous site conditions are identified and appropriately managed in accordance with regulations prior to land development, this mitigation measure would reduce the effect to less than significant. The USACE finds that this **direct** and **indirect** effect would be reduced to **less than significant**.

Off-Site Alt.

As discussed above, no site-specific information has been obtained regarding soil and groundwater conditions at the Off-Site Alternative site. Based on observations of low intensity farming practices (i.e., grazing), there is a low potential for significant effects related to soil or groundwater contamination at the alternative site and according to a database search there are no hazardous materials sites present on the alternative site. However, construction of the Off-Site Alternative could encounter contaminated soil and groundwater due to past agricultural activities which would be a hazard to construction workers and there is a potential for **significant direct** and **indirect** effects related to these conditions to occur based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the on-site alternatives.

If soil or groundwater contamination is encountered, **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1** would address this effect. The USACE assumes that the City of Roseville would impose the same mitigation measure on the Off-Site Alternative. The USACE finds that the measure would reduce the **direct** and **indirect** effect to **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Soil and Groundwater Contamination
(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)

Prior to site development in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP), recommended testing and remediation, if needed shall occur. Groundwater wells shall be properly closed.

If evidence of soil contamination, septic tanks, or other underground storage tanks are encountered in previously unidentified locations in the SVSP area, work shall cease until the area can be tested, and if necessary remediated and/or properly removed or closed. Remediation activities could include removal of contaminated soil and/or on-site treatment. As part of the process, the City shall ensure that any necessary investigation and/or remediation activities are coordinated with the Roseville Fire Department, Placer County Division of Environmental Health,

and if needed, other appropriate federal, state, and local agencies. Once a site is remediated, construction can continue.

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

No Action Alt.

Hazards from the accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during construction and operation of the No Action Alternative, including the operation of a groundwater well and the transportation of hazardous materials, would result in **less than significant direct** and **indirect** effects. Mitigation is not required.

Construction

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 or operation of the project, particularly by untrained personnel; transportation accidents; unsound disposal methods; or fire, explosion, or other emergencies. As part of the project, construction activities on-site under the No Action Alternative would be required to comply with federal and state hazardous materials regulations and worker safety regulations, discussed in **Subsection 3.9.3** above, regarding handling of and exposure to hazardous substances. These regulations must be implemented by employers and businesses and are enforced by the state (Cal OSHA for workplace safety and DTSC for hazardous materials and waste). In addition, all construction projects involving 1 acre (0.4 hectare) or more of ground disturbance would be 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. Effective July 1, 2010, 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 previous requirements. Compliance with federal regulations, which is part of the project, would reduce the risk to human health and the environment from the routine use of hazardous substances during construction, and the **direct** effects would be **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

Project Operation

Once the project site is developed, residential and commercial uses would involve use and storage of hazardous materials. These materials would likely 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.

Building maintenance operations as well as businesses such as auto repair, gas stations, and medical offices that may be developed on the project site would also 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 3.9.3** 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 substances. 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 (Roseville Fire Department).

The fire department 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. Compliance with these regulations, which is part of the project, would avoid significant effects associated with chemical use and storage and this **indirect** effect would be **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

Groundwater Wells

There are no known existing groundwater wells on the site. The proposed groundwater well would include wellhead chlorination and fluoridation. Operation of the groundwater well could include 25 gallons a day of commercial strength bleach (12.5 percent), or 200 gallons a week. Deliveries would be weekly. Well tanks would be sized to hold up to 400 gallons. All chemicals would be stored inside buildings with appropriate containment. Well operation, including chlorination chemical use, storage, and transport, would be subject to applicable federal regulations as described above. Compliance with these regulations, which is part of the project, would avoid significant effects associated with chemical use and storage at the on-site well and this **indirect** effect would be **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

Hazardous Materials Transportation

Construction and operation of development under the No Action Alternative would

involve transport of hazardous materials, potentially including large quantities of construction and maintenance supplies containing 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. Compliance with applicable regulations, which is part of the project, would reduce or avoid the risk of significant effects related to transport of hazardous materials and this **direct** and **indirect** effect would be **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

Proposed Action, Alts. 1 through 5

The Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5 would construct a moderate-scale mixed-use development on the project site similar to the No Action Alternative. The risk of significant effects from use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous wastes would be similar to those described above for the No Action Alternative and would be minimized by compliance with applicable regulations, which is part of the project. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, the **direct** and **indirect** effects associated with the use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous wastes would be **less than significant** under the Proposed Action and the on-site alternatives. Mitigation is not required.

Off-Site Alt.

The Off-Site Alternative would construct a project broadly similar to the No Action Alternative at the alternative site. The risk of significant effects from use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous wastes would be similar to the No Action Alternative and would be minimized by compliance with applicable regulations, which is part of the project. The Western Regional Landfill is located approximately 1 mile (1.6 kilometers) to the northwest of the alternative site. Most development planned under the Off-Site Alternative would be located at least a mile from the landfill. The only exception is a commercial area located along the northwestern boundary of the alternative site that would be approximately 0.75 mile from the landfill at the nearest point. However, no residential uses or schools, which are considered sensitive land uses, would be located within this area. In addition, an open space buffer is planned along the eastern boundary of the alternative site to buffer sensitive land uses on the alternative site from industrial uses located in the Sunset Industrial area to the east. Similarly, an open space buffer is also planned on the alternative site around the peaking plant to buffer sensitive uses on the alternative site from the peaking plant. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, the **direct** and **indirect** effects associated with the use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous wastes would be **less than significant** under the Off-Site Alternative. Mitigation is not required.

Impact HAZ-3 Risk related to Use of Recycled Water

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

The use of recycled water on the project site under the Proposed Action and any of the on-site alternatives would not result in any conditions that would unduly expose future occupants to human health risks, and no significant effects related to the use of recycled water on the project site is anticipated. This **indirect** effect is considered **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required. **No direct** effect would occur.

The use of recycled water on the project site would not result in any conditions that would unduly expose future occupants to human health risks. As described in **Chapter 2.0**, recycled water would be conveyed to the project site from the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP) and used for irrigation of parks and landscaping in roadway medians, commercial areas, and common areas in high-density residential neighborhoods. Individuals using or maintaining the parks and landscaped facilities would have skin contact with the water when these features are actively irrigated, for example by touching irrigated grass or runoff. The rates and frequency of application would be controlled to minimize ponding, as required under Municipal Code Chapter 14.17 and the City's "Rules and Regulations for the Use of Recycled Water" (see **Section 3.15, Utilities and Service Systems**). 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. As part of the project, any recycled water to be used on the site would meet state regulatory standards, as outlined in **Subsection 3.9.3** 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. The City of Roseville 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 3.9.3** above, cross-connection controls would ensure that recycled water does not enter the potable water distribution system. For these reasons, the use of recycled water would not result in any conditions that would unduly expose future occupants to human health risks, and no significant effect related to the use of recycled water on the project site is anticipated. This **indirect** effect is considered **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required. **No direct** effect would occur.

Off-Site Alt.

The Off-Site Alternative would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action at the alternative site. The alternative could include use of recycled water similar to the other alternatives. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons as presented above, the **indirect** effects associated with the use of recycled water on the project site would be **less than significant** under the Off-Site Alternative. Mitigation is not required. **No direct** effect would occur.

3.9.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

All of the **direct** and **indirect** effects would either be **less than significant** or would be reduced to **less than significant** with mitigation. There would be no residual significant effects for the Proposed Action and any of the alternatives.

3.9.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The effects discussed above are less than significant and site-specific and would therefore not cumulate. There would be no cumulative effects related to hazards and hazardous materials under the Proposed Action and all alternatives.

3.9.8 REFERENCES

City of Roseville. 2010a. *Sierra Vista Specific Plan Final Environmental Report*.

City of Roseville. 2010b. *City of Roseville General Plan 2025*. Adopted May 5, 2010.

Environmental Data Resources (EDR). 2012. *EDR Radius Map Report: Placer Ranch Alternative, N Foothill Blvd/W Sunset Blvd, Lincoln, California 95648*. May 30.