

## **5.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The analysis in this section of the EIR addresses the potential impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials that may occur due to implementation of the proposed Collier Park Renovations Project Master Plan.

### **5.7.1 Regulatory Framework**

#### **5.7.1.1 Federal**

##### **Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act**

Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), commonly known as Superfund, on December 11, 1980. CERCLA established prohibitions and requirements concerning closed and abandoned hazardous waste sites; provided for liability of persons responsible for releases of hazardous waste at these sites; and established a trust fund to provide for cleanup when no responsible party could be identified. The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) amended the CERCLA on October 17, 1986. SARA stressed the importance of permanent remedies and innovative treatment technologies in cleaning up hazardous waste sites; required Superfund actions to consider the standards and requirements found in other state and federal environmental laws and regulations; provided new enforcement authorities and settlement tools; increased state involvement in every phase of the Superfund program; increased the focus on human health problems posed by hazardous waste sites; encouraged greater citizen participation in making decisions on how sites should be cleaned up; and increased the size of the trust fund to \$8.5 billion.

##### **Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77**

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has primary responsibility for the safety of civil aviation. The FAA's major functions regarding hazards include the following: (1) developing and operating a common system of air traffic control and navigation for both civil and military aircraft; (2) developing and implementing programs to control aircraft noise and other environmental effects of civil aviation; (3) regulating U.S. commercial space transportation; and (4) conducting reviews to determine that the safety of persons and property on the ground are protected. Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, establishes standards for determining obstructions in navigable airspace; sets forth the requirements for notice to the FAA of certain proposed construction or alteration; provides for aeronautical studies of obstructions to air navigation in order to determine their effect on the safe and efficient use of airspace; provides for public hearings on the hazardous effect of proposed construction or alteration on air navigation; and provides for establishing antenna farm areas. FAA Form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, must be filed with the FAA regional office prior to construction of buildings that are 200 feet or higher above the graded terrain. Minimum FAA safety standards include the marking or lighting of any structures 200 feet in height or greater from the graded terrain.

## Resources Conservation and Recovery Act

The federal Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976, as amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, provides for the management of hazardous wastes for its entire existence (generation to disposal) to ensure that it is handled in a manner that protects human health and the environment. Under RCRA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has established regulations and procedures for the generation, transportation, storage, and disposal activities of hazardous waste handlers, as well as technical standards for the design and safe operation of treatment, storage, and disposal facilities to minimize the release of hazardous waste into the environment. RCRA's corrective action program is designed to investigate and guide the cleanup of any contaminated air, groundwater, surface water, or soil from hazardous waste management of spills or releases into the environment as a result of the past and present activities at RCRA-regulated facilities.

## USEPA Regional Screening Levels

Using risk assessment guidance from the Superfund program, USEPA regional divisions have developed Regional Screening Levels (formerly Preliminary Remediation Goals) for chemical contaminants. Regional Screening Levels are risk-based contaminant concentrations, derived from standardized equation combining exposure information assumptions with USEPA toxicity data, considered to be protective of humans (including sensitive groups) over a lifetime. Regional Screening Levels are based upon human health risk and do not address potential ecological risk. As such, Regional Screening Levels are used for site screening to help identify conditions that may warrant further investigation and are not intended to be used as cleanup standards.

### 5.7.1.2 State

#### California Code of Regulations Section 1529, Asbestos

California Code of Regulations Section 1529, Asbestos, regulates exposure to asbestos in construction work. The following permissible exposure limits are established under this section:

- 1) Time-Weighted Average Limit. The employer shall ensure that no employee is exposed to an airborne concentration of asbestos in excess of 0.1 fiber per cubic centimeter of air as an eight hour time-weighted average.
- 2) Excursion Limit. The employer shall ensure that no employee is exposed to an airborne concentration of asbestos in excess of 1.0 fiber per cubic centimeter of air as averaged over a sampling period of 30 minutes.

#### California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1, Lead

California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1, Lead, applies to all construction work where a worker may be occupationally exposed to lead. The following permissible exposure limits are established under this section:

- 1) The employer shall assure that no employee is exposed to lead at concentrations greater than 50 micrograms per cubic meter of air ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) averaged over an eight-hour period.
- 2) If an employee is exposed to lead for more than eight hours in any work day the employees' allowable exposure, as a time-weighted average for that day, shall be reduced according to the

following formula: allowable employee exposure (in  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) = 400 divided by hours worked in the day.

- 3) When respirators are used to limit employee exposure as required under subsection (c) and all the requirements of subsections (e)(1) and (f) have been met, employee exposure may be considered to be at the level provided by the protection factor of the respirator for those periods the respirator is worn. Those periods may be averaged with exposure levels during periods when respirators are not worn to determine the employee's daily time-weighted average exposure.

## California Fire Code

The California Fire Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 9) is based on the International Fire Code, with necessary California amendments. The purpose of the California Fire Code is to establish the minimum requirements consistent with nationally recognized good practices to safeguard the public health, safety, and general welfare from the hazards of fire, explosion, or dangerous conditions in new and existing buildings, structures, and premises, as well as to provide safety and assistance to firefighters and emergency responders during emergency operations. The California Fire Code establishes regulations regarding the following:

- 1) The hazard of fire and explosion arising from the storage, handling, or use of structures, materials, or devices;
- 2) Conditions hazardous to life, property, or public welfare in the use or occupancy of buildings, structures, or premises;
- 3) Fire hazards in the buildings, structures, or on premises from use of, occupancy of, or operation;
- 4) Matters related to the construction, extension, repair, alteration, or removal of fire suppression or alarm systems; and
- 5) Conditions affecting the safety of firefighters and emergency responders during emergency operations.

## California Government Code Section 65962.5

The "Cortese List" refers to several government databases, compiled and updated by state regulatory agencies pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5, which identify potential hazardous materials sites, including sites that may have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and hazardous waste facilities. A site's presence on the Cortese List can affect the local permitting process and compliance with the CEQA. Data resources that provide information regarding the sites and facilities identified as meeting the Cortese List requirements include the following (CalEPA 2012):

- List of Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites from the DTSC EnviroStor database;
- List of Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Sites by County and Fiscal Year from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker database;
- List of Solid Waste Disposal Sites identified by the SWRCB with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit;
- List of "active" Cease and Desist Orders and Cleanup and Abatement Orders from the SWRCB; and

- List of Hazardous Waste Facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25187.5, identified by DTSC.

## California Hazardous Waste Control Law

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), a part of the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste under the authority of the federal RCRA and the California Hazardous Waste Control Law. Both laws impose “cradle to grave” regulatory systems for handling hazardous waste in a manner that protects human health and the environment.

## Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Act

The Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Act requires facilities that handle hazardous materials in amounts above threshold quantities to establish and implement hazardous materials business plans. Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25504, hazardous materials business plans must contain a hazardous materials inventory disclosing the type, quantity, use, location, and health risks of every hazardous substance, chemical product, and waste handled by the facility; emergency response plans and procedures in the event of a reportable release or threatened release of a hazardous material; and provisions for employee training in safety procedures.

### 5.7.1.3 Regional

#### San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (County of San Diego 2010) is a countywide plan that identifies risks and ways to minimize damage by natural and manmade disasters. The Hazard Mitigation Plan is a comprehensive resource document that is intended to serve many purposes, including to enhance public awareness and understanding; create a decision tool for management; promote compliance with state and federal program requirements; enhance local policies for hazard mitigation capability; provide inter-jurisdictional coordination of mitigation-related programming; and achieve regulatory compliance. The Hazard Mitigation Plan provides a hazard risk assessment and identifies goals, objectives, and actions for each jurisdiction. The risk assessment process involves identifying hazards, profiling hazard, identifying assets, assessing vulnerability, identifying repetitive loss, and analyzing development trends. The following hazards have been identified as posing the most threat to San Diego region and have been profiled in the Hazard Mitigation Plan: Wildfire/Structure Fire, Flood, Coastal Storms/Erosions/Tsunami, Earthquake/Liquefaction, Rain-Induced Landslides; Dam Failure; Hazardous Materials Incidents; Nuclear Materials Release; and Terrorism.

#### San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) serves as the region’s Airport Land Use Commission, which is responsible for adopting Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs) for the County’s 16 public-use and military airports. ALUCPs provide guidance on appropriate land uses surrounding airports to protect the health and safety of people and property within the vicinity of an airport, as well as the public in general. ALUCPs focus on a defined area around each airport known as the Airport Influence Area (AIA), which is comprised of noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight factors. The AIA is divided into the following areas:

- Review Area 1. Review Area 1 consists of locations where noise and safety concerns may necessitate limitations on the types of land use actions. Specifically, Review Area 1 encompasses locations exposed to aircraft noise levels of 60 dB CNEL or greater together with all of the safety zones.
- Review Area 2. Review Area 2 consists of locations beyond Review Area 1 but within the airspace protection and overflight notification areas. Limits on the heights of structures, particularly in areas of high terrain, are the only restrictions on land uses within Review Area 2. The recordation of overflight notification documents is also required in locations within Review Area 2.

Once ALUCPs have been adopted, local agencies with land located within the AIA boundary for any of the airports must, by law, amend their planning documents to conform to the applicable ALUCP. By providing direction to local agencies in their land use decisions, ALUCPs help maintain the nation's air transportation infrastructure by protecting airports from encroachment by incompatible land uses that could restrict their operations.

## **San Diego County Site Assessment and Mitigation Program**

The County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH) is the regional agency generally entrusted with the monitoring and enforcement of various laws and regulations governing the handling, use, transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. The DEH maintains the Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) list of contaminated sites that have previously or are currently undergoing environmental investigations and/or remedial actions. The SAM Program, within the Land and Water Quality Division of the DEH, has a primary purpose to protect human health, water resources, and the environment within San Diego County by providing oversight of assessments and cleanups in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code and the California Code of Regulations. The SAM's Voluntary Assistance Program also provides staff consultation, project oversight, and technical or environmental report evaluation and concurrence (when appropriate) on projects pertaining to properties contaminated with hazardous substances.

### **5.7.1.4 Local**

#### **City of La Mesa Emergency Plan**

The La Mesa Emergency Plan describes a comprehensive emergency management system for response to natural and man-made disasters. The Emergency Plan identifies lines of authority and operational responsibilities, and outlines a framework for the continuity of government and maintenance of City services. The Emergency Plan provides City staff with the basis for an effective response in the event of a local or region-wide disaster.

#### **City of La Mesa Fire Code**

La Mesa Municipal Code Chapter 11.04, Fire Code, adopts the 2010 California Fire Code as the fire code of the City of La Mesa for regulating and governing the safeguarding of life and property from fire and explosion hazards arising from the storage, handling, and use of hazardous substances, materials, and devices; and from conditions hazardous to life or property in the occupancy of buildings and premises, erection, construction, enlargement, alteration, repair, moving, removal, conversion, demolition, equipment use, and maintenance of buildings and structures.

## 5.7.2 Existing Conditions

### 5.7.2.1 Cortese List Database Search

The Cortese List databases, compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5 (described in Section 5.7.1.2 above), were searched for any existing hazardous materials sites located within one-half mile of Collier Park. A one-half mile search radius was selected because wind or waterborne contaminants would be dispersed/diluted at this distance such that harmful concentrations would be unlikely to have migrated to the project site. Within the one-half mile search radius, eight potential hazardous materials sites were identified on the Cortese List databases. Information regarding these sites is summarized in Table 5.7-1 and discussed below in further detail. However, the project site is not included on any of the Cortese List databases.

**Table 5.7-1 Potential Hazardous Materials Sites within One-Half Mile of Collier Park**

Site Name	Site Type	Global ID	Cleanup Status	Address
Former 7-Eleven Food Store #20884	LUST Cleanup	T0607302324	Open – Remediation	4253 Palm Avenue
Bob Bowens Service	LUST Cleanup	T0607300042	Completed – Case Closed	8381 La Mesa Boulevard
Chevron #91681	LUST Cleanup	T0607301502	Completed – Case Closed	4209 Spring Street
Circle K #2954	LUST Cleanup	T0607300575	Completed – Case Closed	4301 Palm Avenue
Former Service Station	LUST Cleanup	T0607310456	Completed – Case Closed	8401 La Mesa Boulevard
La Mesa Redevelopment Agency	LUST Cleanup	T0607300035	Completed – Case Closed	8200 La Mesa Boulevard
Pacific Bell LAMSCA01/D3116	LUST Cleanup	T0607300890	Completed – Case Closed	4711 Spring Street
Spring Street Shell	LUST Cleanup	T0607300165	Completed – Case Closed	4200 Spring Street

Source: SWRCB 2012

### 7-Eleven Food Store #20884

The former 7-Eleven Food Store #20884 is listed as a LUST cleanup site on the GeoTracker database (SWRCB 2012). The site is located at 4253 Palm Avenue, which is approximately 750 feet south of Collier Park. The record indicates that the potential contaminant of concern is gasoline and the potential media affected is an aquifer used for drinking water supply. The case was opened on April 29, 1997, and has been under remediation as of June 9, 1998. A combined air sparging and soil vapor extraction system designed to remediate both soil and groundwater was installed and began operation on February 27, 2007. The system was shut down on July 15, 2010, for rebound monitoring of hydrocarbon concentrations in groundwater. Quarterly groundwater monitoring and sampling is ongoing at seven wells as part of the verification assessment. Groundwater flow direction is generally to the south-southeast with an average hydraulic gradient of 0.03 to 0.05 feet per horizontal foot. The groundwater monitoring and remediation progress report dated January 13, 2012, indicates that a soil vapor survey and risk assessment will be initiated to verify that remediation at the site is complete. Due to the progress of remediation and the direction of groundwater flow downstream to the south and away from Collier Park, it is unlikely that contaminants from this LUST cleanup site have migrated to the project site.

### Bob Bowen's Service

Bob Bowen's Service (former location, which is now occupied by Don Keating Used Cars) is listed as a LUST Cleanup Site on the GeoTracker Database (SWRCB 2012). The site is located at 8381 La Mesa

Boulevard, which is approximately 2,000 feet north of Collier Park. The record indicates that the potential contaminant of concern is petroleum hydrocarbons (gasoline and waste oil). The case was opened on July 12, 1988, and site cleanup has been completed and the case closed as of June 26, 1997. The case closure summary indicates that drinking water wells and surface water were not affected by the release. Thus, it is unlikely that contaminants from this site have migrated to the project site.

### **Chevron #91681**

Chevron #91681 (former service station) is listed as a LUST Cleanup Site on the GeoTracker Database (SWRCB 2012). The site is located at 4209 Spring Street, which is approximately 1,000 feet south of Collier Park. The record indicates that the potential contaminant of concern is gasoline and the potential media affected is an aquifer used for drinking water supply. The case was opened on January 16, 1994, and site cleanup has been completed and the case closed as of June 13, 2007. The case closure summary indicates that the groundwater flow direction is southeast (measured), and that drinking water wells and surface water were not affected by the release. Thus, it is unlikely that contaminants from this site, which is downstream from the project site, have migrated to the project site.

### **Circle K #2954**

Circle K #2954 (former service station) is listed as a LUST Cleanup Site on the GeoTracker Database (SWRCB 2012). The site is located at 4301 Palm Avenue, which is approximately 250 feet south of Collier Park. The record indicates that the potential contaminant of concern is gasoline and the potential media affected is an aquifer used for drinking water supply. The case was opened on October 11, 1990, and site cleanup has been completed and the case closed as of December 6, 2002. The case closure summary indicates that the groundwater flow direction is southeast, and that drinking water wells and surface water were not affected by the release. Thus, it is unlikely that contaminants from this site, which is downstream from the project site, have migrated to the project site.

### **Former Service Station**

A Former Service Station is listed as a LUST Cleanup Site on the GeoTracker Database (SWRCB 2012). The site is located at 8401 La Mesa Boulevard, which is approximately 2,000 feet north of Collier Park. The record indicates that the potential contaminant of concern is gasoline and the potential media affected is soil. The case was opened on August 27, 2003, and site cleanup has been completed and the case closed as of September 7, 2004. The case closure summary indicates that the groundwater flow direction is northwest (estimated), and that drinking water wells and surface water were not affected by the release. Thus, it is unlikely that contaminants from this site have migrated to the project site.

### **La Mesa Redevelopment Agency**

La Mesa Redevelopment Agency is listed as a LUST Cleanup Site on the GeoTracker Database (SWRCB 2012). The site is located at 8200 La Mesa Boulevard, which is approximately 2,000 feet northwest of Collier Park. The record does not specify the potential contaminant of concern. The case was opened on May 26, 1988, and site cleanup has been completed and the case closed as of March 30, 1992. Although the case closure summary was not provided on the database, due to the completed cleanup status that occurred 20 years ago, it is unlikely that contaminants from this site have migrated to the project site.

## **Pacific Bell LAMSCA01/D3116**

Pacific Bell LAMSCA01/D3116 (dba AT&T) is listed as a LUST Cleanup Site on the GeoTracker Database (SWRCB 2012). The site is located at 4711 Spring Street, which is approximately 2,000 feet northwest of Collier Park. The record indicates that the potential contaminant of concern is diesel. The case was opened on December 17, 1991, and site cleanup has been completed and the case closed as of September 30, 1997. The case closure summary indicates that the groundwater flow direction is south/southeast (estimated), and that drinking water wells and surface water were not affected by the release. Thus, it is unlikely that contaminants from this site have migrated to the project site.

## **Spring Street Shell**

Spring Street Shell (former service station) is listed as a LUST Cleanup Site on the GeoTracker Database (SWRCB 2012). The site is located at 4200 Spring Street, which is approximately 1,000 feet south of the Collier Park. The record indicates that the potential contaminant of concern is gasoline and the potential media affected is an aquifer used for drinking water supply. The case was opened on September 19, 1988, with remediation from October 9, 1990, followed by site assessment from July 7, 2009. Remedial activities included pumping and treatment of 1,500 gallons of groundwater and excavation of 1,300 cubic yards of impacted soil. Site cleanup has been completed and the case closed as of January 21, 2011. The case closure summary indicates that the groundwater flow direction is east-southeast (measured), and that drinking water wells and surface water were not affected by the release. Thus, it is unlikely that contaminants from this site have migrated to the project site.

### **5.7.2.2 Airports**

Gillespie Field airport is located approximately 4.5 miles northeast of Collier Park in the City of El Cajon. Gillespie Field is a general aviation reliever airport operated by the County of San Diego, Department of Public Works. The airport has three runways between 2,737 and 5,341 feet long; two runways are aligned east-west and one is aligned north-south. In 2011, the airport had 209,868 flight operations (County of San Diego 2012). According to the Gillespie Field ALUCP (SDCRAA 2010), Collier Park is not located within the airport's AIA.

Montgomery Field airport is located approximately 7.5 miles northwest of Collier Park in the City of San Diego. Montgomery Field is a general aviation reliever airport operated by the City of San Diego. The airport has three runways between 1,176 and 4,577 feet long; two runways are aligned northwest-southeast and one is aligned northeast-southwest. The airport also includes a heliport used only by the City of San Diego Police Department. In 2006, the airport had 236,000 flight operations (SDCRAA 2010). According to the Montgomery Field ALUCP (SDCRAA 2010), Collier Park is located within Review Area 2 of the airport's AIA.

The Grossmont Hospital heliport is located approximately 1.5 miles northeast of Collier Park in the City of La Mesa. The heliport is privately owned and operated by the Grossmont Hospital District. Five to ten flights are normally flown to the hospital every month, typically during standard business hours (City of La Mesa 1996).

### 5.7.3 Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a significant impact associated with hazards and hazardous materials would occur if implementation of the proposed project would:

- **Threshold 1:** Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- **Threshold 2:** Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- **Threshold 3:** Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- **Threshold 4:** Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- **Threshold 5:** Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- **Threshold 6:** Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- **Threshold 7:** Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- **Threshold 8:** Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

### 5.7.4 Impacts

#### 5.7.4.1 Use and Release of Hazardous Materials

**Threshold 1: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**Threshold 2: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

The proposed project would involve the temporary use of fuels and oils for construction equipment and the limited use of household cleaning products, fertilizers, and pesticides for park maintenance. Use of these common hazardous materials in accordance with labeled instructions would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. However, leaks and spills from construction equipment could potentially release hazardous materials to the environment. Compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to the handling and storage of hazardous materials, including DTSC regulations and the California Fire Code, would minimize the potential for leaks and spills. Furthermore, implementation of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) pursuant to the NPDES Construction General Permit, which includes requirements for spill containment

and cleanup procedures, would prevent a significant hazard to the public or the environment in the event of a release. The project would not result in the routine transport of hazardous materials and disposal of any hazardous materials would be conducted in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

The proposed project includes the demolition of the existing Spring House, which may contain asbestos and lead-based paints. Construction workers could potentially be exposed to these substances during demolition of the structure. However, compliance with the California Code of Regulations Sections 1529 and 1532.1, which establish permissible exposure limits for asbestos and lead, respectively, would prevent a significant hazard to construction workers from potential exposure to these substances. In addition, the project would comply with applicable OSHA regulations regarding general and construction industry standards for asbestos. Therefore, impacts associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

### 5.7.4.2 Hazards to Schools

**Threshold 3: Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

The following four schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site:

- Grey Rabbit Preschool located at 4542 Palm Avenue, which is approximately 600 feet northwest of Collier Park.
- Liberty Charter High School located at 4207 Spring Gardens Road, which is approximately 800 feet southeast of Collier Park.
- Gateway Community Day School located at 8691 Echo Drive, which is approximately 1,000 feet southeast of Collier Park.
- Learning Choice Academy located at 4215 Spring Street, which is approximately 1,000 feet south of Collier Park.

As discussed in Section 5.7.4.1 above, the proposed project would involve the temporary use of fuels and oils for construction equipment and the limited use of household cleaning products, fertilizers, and pesticides for park maintenance. Use of these common hazardous materials in accordance with labeled instructions and compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to the handling and storage of hazardous materials, including DTSC regulations and the California Fire Code, would prevent a significant hazard to nearby schools. In addition, the proposed project would not expose nearby schools to emissions of substantial air pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors (as further detailed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, of this EIR). Therefore, impacts associated with hazards to schools would be less than significant.

### 5.7.4.3 Hazardous Materials Sites

**Threshold 4: Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

As stated in Section 5.7.2.1 above, the project site is not included on the Cortese List databases compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5; however, eight LUST cleanup sites have been identified within a one-half mile search radius of the project site. As shown in Table 5.7-1, the records indicate that site cleanup has been completed and the cases closed for seven of the LUST cleanup sites. Thus, it is unlikely that contaminants from these seven sites have migrated to the project site.

The record for the remaining LUST cleanup site, identified as 7-Eleven Food Store #20884, indicates that the case was opened on April 29, 1997, and has been under remediation as of June 9, 1998. As discussed in Section 5.7.2.1 above, due to the progress of remediation and the direction of groundwater flow downstream to the south and away from Collier Park, it is unlikely that contaminants from this LUST cleanup site have migrated to the project site. Therefore, impacts associated with hazardous materials sites would be less than significant.

### 5.7.4.4 Airport Safety Hazards

**Threshold 5: Would the project be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

**Threshold 6: Would the project be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

As stated in Section 5.7.2.2 above, the project site is located approximately 4.5 miles from Gillespie Field airport, approximately 7.5 from Montgomery Field airport, and 1.5 miles from the Grossmont Hospital heliport. The project site not located within the Gillespie Field AIA, which is the area in which airport-related noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight notification factors may affect or necessitate restrictions on land uses (SDCRAA 2010). Thus, the project site would not be subject to safety hazards associated with Gillespie Field operations. However, the project site is located within Review Area 2 of the Montgomery Field AIA, which consists of locations beyond the noise and safety zones, but within the airspace protection and overflight notification areas (SDCRAA 2012). Specifically, the project site lies within the airspace surfaces of Montgomery Field, which depict areas that should be kept free of obstruction and protected for the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft. Because the proposed project would not include any structures that exceed the Federal Air Regulations Part 77 height restrictions for the airspace protection area, the project site would not be subject to safety hazards associated with Montgomery Field operations. Furthermore, due to the distance from the Grossmont Hospital heliport and the relatively low number of flights from this facility (five to ten per month), the project site would not be subject to safety hazards associated with heliport operations. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in airport safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

### 5.7.4.5 Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

**Threshold 7: Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

The La Mesa Emergency Plan is the adopted emergency response plan for the City of La Mesa. The proposed project would require that the segment of Pasadena Avenue that passes through the project site be temporarily closed for three to six months during construction. This segment of Pasadena Avenue is used as a through street between Palm Avenue and 4th Street/Upland Avenue to access surrounding residences. However, these areas can be accessed by alternative routes via Fresno Avenue and/or 3rd Street such that emergency response would not be impeded during the temporary closure of Pasadena Avenue. In addition, Pasadena Avenue is not a major transit corridor that would be used as an evacuation route. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

### 5.7.4.6 Wildland Fires

**Threshold 8: Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

Wildland fires occur in rural areas and where development interfaces with undeveloped areas. Although the City of La Mesa is an urban community, wildland fire risks are present in the remaining pockets of undeveloped open land area, including Keeney Street canyon south of Interstate 8 and portions of Eastridge and Mount Helix, which are characterized by limited access, steep terrain, thick vegetation cover, and deficient hydrant spacing and water pressure (City of La Mesa 1996). The project site is located within a highly developed urban area of La Mesa, which is not considered at high risk for wildland fires, and is not adjacent to any undeveloped open land areas that are susceptible to wildland fires. Furthermore, the proposed project would comply with the City's Fire Code (La Mesa Municipal Code Title 11), including all applicable requirements for fuel management and brush clearance to minimize on-site fire hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

## 5.7.5 Mitigation Measures

### 5.7.5.1 Use and Release of Hazardous Materials

No significant impacts related to the use and release of hazardous materials would result from implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

### 5.7.5.2 Hazards to Schools

No significant impacts related to hazards to schools would result from implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

### 5.7.5.3 Hazardous Materials Sites

No significant impacts related to hazardous materials sites would result from implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

### 5.7.5.4 Airport Safety Hazards

No significant impacts related to airport safety hazards would result from implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

### 5.7.5.5 Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

No significant impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans would result from implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

### 5.7.5.6 Wildland Fires

No significant impacts related to wildland fires would result from implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## 5.7.6 Significance Determination

The significance of hazards and hazardous materials impacts before and after mitigation is summarized in Table 5.7-2. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to the use and release of hazardous materials, hazards to schools, hazardous materials sites, airport safety hazards, emergency response and evacuation plans, and wildland fires. Therefore, impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant without mitigation.

**Table 5.7-2 Summary of Significance of Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts**

Issue	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
Use and Release of Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
Hazards to Schools	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
Hazardous Materials Sites	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
Airport Safety Hazards	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
Wildland Fires	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

This page intentionally left blank.