

## 4.8 PUBLIC HEALTH AND HAZARDS

This section addresses potential impacts related to hazardous materials and hazards associated with historic and current use of the project site and surrounding areas. This section is based in part on a review of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and the Phase II Soils Sampling and Testing Program prepared by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates (2005). The potential for impacts on fire personnel and other emergency responders is addressed in Section 4.6, Utilities and Public Services, of this Draft EIR. The impacts of airborne toxics risks are discussed in Section 4.3, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR.

### 4.8.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

For purposes of this section, the term “hazardous materials” refers to both hazardous substances and hazardous wastes. A “hazardous material” is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) as “a substance or material that ... is capable of posing an unreasonable risk to health, safety, and property when transported in commerce” (49 CFR 171.8). California Health and Safety Code Section 25501 defines a hazardous material as follows:

“Hazardous material” means any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment. “Hazardous materials” include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous waste, 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 defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 25141(b) as wastes that:

... because of their quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, [may either] cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious illness [, or] pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported, disposed of, or otherwise managed.

#### LAND USES AND CONDITIONS ON THE PROJECT SITE

The project site is located within a predominantly rural residential area and consists of gently rolling hills, a former homestead site, a former rural residence, and fallow land. Wallace-Kuhl & Associates completed a Phase 1 ESA for the site in January 2005 (Wallace-Kuhl & Associates 2005). During completion of the Phase 1 ESA, Wallace-Kuhl & Associates reviewed historical U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps dated 1944, 1954, 1967, and 1981, with coverage of the project area. No evidence was observed on the maps to suggest that the property was disturbed by intensive human activities such as quarrying, subsurface or surface mining, or dredging. Wallace-Kuhl & Associates also reviewed historic aerial photos of the property dating back to 1962. The historic aerial photos showed no aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) or underground storage tank (UST) fueling islands. Wallace Kuhl & Associates did not notice any stained or odoriferous soils or areas of stressed vegetation on the property surface.

The Takuma Japanese homestead site is south of Interstate 80 in the northern portion of the site. A vent pipe, fill port, and dispenser pipe of a UST were observed on the homestead site. A 550-gallon underground storage tank was identified by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates. The UST was removed on December 14, 2004, which was observed by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates. No residual contamination was documented following its removal.

A former rural residential site consisting of a house, two sheds, and a well pump house was located in the southeast portion of the project site. This rural residence has since been demolished. The former Takuma Japanese homestead site likely had a water supply well; however, no well was identified by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates.

### **On-Site Fill Soils**

A significant amount of fill soil is located east of the former rural residential site. The fill soil area is approximately 190 feet wide (east to west) and 290 feet long (north to south) and estimated to be approximately 18,000 cubic yards. No stained or odoriferous soils were observed at the ground surface. Given the soils unknown origin, a Phase II soils sampling and testing program was conducted concurrently with the Phase I ESA to evaluate fill soil for metals and potential agricultural chemical residuals, including organochlorine pesticides (e.g., dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane [DDT]) and metals. A total of 26 soil samples were collected from the fill soil from variable depths so as to represent the range of fill soil conditions.

Because heavy metals are naturally occurring in soils, any soils analysis will produce detections of metals. To determine health risks associated with persistent containments, it is also necessary to compare detected chemical residual concentrations to their U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) health-based Preliminary Remedial Goals (PRGs) criteria. PRGs are a screening tool often used to initially evaluate whether a particular site may require additional study or remediation due to persistent pesticide residuals in soil.

Laboratory test results detected metals concentrations and organochlorine compounds in the soil samples well below their EPA health-based PRGs values. The majority of the detected metals concentrations are also consistent with or lower than the median, naturally occurring background metals concentrations in soil.

### **Use of Agricultural Chemicals on the Project Site**

Wallace-Kuhl & Associates discussed past agricultural operations on the project site with Doug Mitani, the now-retired Placer County Agricultural Commissioner. Mr. Mitani confirmed that areas on the project site and in the project vicinity have historically supported orchards. The Placer County Agricultural Commissioner's Office has no records of Restricted Use Permits (often associated with registered agricultural chemical applications to crops), Notice of Violation, Cease or Desist Orders, or similar documentations on file for the project site (Wallace-Kuhl & Associates 2005). However, Mr. Mitani concluded that given the age of agricultural development in the past, persistent compounds were likely used on the project site; that is, these compounds possibly leave residues that remain in the environment without breaking down such as organochlorine pesticides (e.g., DDT, Toxaphene, and Dieldrin).

The Phase II soils sampling and testing program addressed the potential for concentrations of persistent pesticides. In addition, lead and arsenic are also potential persistent contaminants (particularly on historic orchard sites), as lead arsenates were commonly applied to orchard trees prior to development of organochlorine compounds. The detected compound concentrations for organochlorine pesticides, arsenic, and lead found in the samples collected from the property are all below their EPA health-based PRG values.

Soil samples were also compared to the naturally occurring background concentrations of metals in soil. The detected arsenic concentrations found in four of the 15 soil samples from the site, and lead concentrations found in one of the 15 soil samples are above the median naturally occurring background metals concentrations in soil; although elevated, as previously discussed, these samples are below their PRG values.

### **POLE-MOUNTED TRANSFORMERS**

Pole-mounted transformers may contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). PCBs are considered hazardous materials because of their toxicity; they have been shown to cause cancer in animals, along with effects on the

immune, reproductive, nervous, and endocrine systems, and studies have shown evidence of similar effects in humans (EPA 2004).

Overhead electrical power lines powered at 12 kilovolts (kVs) and 21 kVs bound the project site on the west side of Sierra College Boulevard. There are also 12 kV overhead power lines that bisect the southern portion of the property.

No high-voltage, tower-mounted electrical transmission lines powered at 230 kV to 480 kV or capacitors were observed on or adjacent to the site. Per the 2005 Wallace-Kuhl & Associates Phase I ESA, several pole-mounted electrical transformers and one concrete-pad mounted transformer exist on the site. However, as a part of the recently initiated Interstate 80/Sierra College Boulevard Interchange Improvement Project, the pad mounted transformer and several pole mounted transformers were relocated off of the project site, but one pole mounted transformer still exists on the project site. No obvious evidence of transformer leakage beneath or around the transformers was observed during the Phase I ESA.

To obtain information pertaining to the potential PCB content of the on-site and nearby electrical transformer, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) was contacted by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates. The PG&E representative indicated that no database exists at PG&E to ascertain a transformer's status regarding its PCB content, although some transformers are tagged "Non-PCB." The pole mounted transformer on the project site is not tagged on the exterior to signify that it does not contain PCB, and is therefore of unknown PCB content. Any leakage or problems with the on-site transformer are the responsibility of PG&E. Refer to additional information presented later in this section on laws pertaining to PCBs, including the labeling of transformers.

## **RESULTS OF RECORDS SEARCH FOR HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

A Phase I ESA was prepared by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates in January 2005 for the project site. The purpose of the Phase I ESA was to document recognized environmental concerns (RECs) on the subject property related to current and historical uses of the area and to evaluate the potential for a release of hazardous materials from on-site or off-site sources that could significantly affect environmental conditions at the project site. The site reconnaissance and records search conducted for the Phase I ESA did not find documentation or physical evidence of RECs in soil or groundwater associated with the use of the proposed project site.

The site was not listed on any county, State, or federal government lists as a contaminated site. There were no known contaminated municipal groundwater wells, active or inactive landfills, or producing California Division of Oil and Gas petroleum wells located on, adjacent to, or within 0.5 mile of the proposed site.

No confirmed, State or federal "Superfund" sites were identified within one mile of the property. One potential State Superfund site, Forest Products Manufacturing, is located at 4315 Dominguez Road over one-half mile west of the project site. Forest Products Manufacturing operated as a wood coating facility, and the site had paint film in dry evaporation ponds, paint solids in drums, and paint solids around paved areas. Mercury was identified as the primary hazardous component of the wastes. The Forest Products Manufacturing site was satisfactorily remediated in 1993 under DTSC oversight.

Three facilities registered for use and/or storage of reportable quantities of hazardous materials, including USTs, are located within one-half mile of the project site (Unocal, 7-Eleven Convenience Store, and Highbridge Ranch):

- ▶ The Unocal service station is located at 4390 Sierra College Boulevard, approximately 600 feet northwest of the project site. The station was remodeled and all fuel dispensing equipment was replaced in July 1998. Approximately 967 tons of contaminated petroleum hydrocarbon soils from the former UST locations were overexcavated and removed from the site. Additionally, 14,400 gallons of contaminated petroleum hydrocarbon groundwater was removed and transported to a facility for treatment and disposal. Twelve groundwater monitoring wells have been installed since 1998. Four of the six on-site groundwater monitoring

wells contained detectable concentrations of Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MtBE). The groundwater monitoring well closest to the site contained no total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel, gasoline, MtBE, or Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylene (BTEX). Quarterly monitoring of the wells has revealed that groundwater flows in a northwest direction, away from the site. Presently quarterly groundwater monitoring is being conducted on the site.

- ▶ The 7-Eleven Convenience Store is located at 4181 Sierra College Boulevard, approximately 500 feet northwest of the site. MtBE has been identified in on-site soils, and is currently undergoing a preliminary site assessment.
- ▶ The Highbridge Ranch was historically located at 4436 Sierra College Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the project site. According to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database, a historical listing of UST sites, this site had one 550-gallon UST. The UST was installed in 1950 and contained regular gasoline. The site is listed as a farm and, as such, has a farm-exempt status. Since the UST is considered farm exempt, no definitive information is on file with any agency regarding the UST. The UST was removed in 2002, and subsequent soil sample analysis indicate no detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel, gasoline or BTEX. The Placer County Environmental Health Department has no other records, such as business plans, hazardous materials disclosures, or hazardous materials releases, for the site. Based on groundwater monitoring at the Unocal service station, which is located to the northwest of the site, groundwater flows at the Highbridge Ranch site are assumed to be to the northwest and away from the proposed project.

EDAW searched the EPA's Envirofacts web site and the SWRCB's GeoTracker web site to identify toxic releases, hazardous waste, or other violations that could affect the site (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2006, State Water Resources Control Board 2006). The Envirofacts web site presents information from several regulatory agencies and databases, including those for the EPA, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and Office of Emergency Services, and contains a variety of environmental information maintained by EPA, such as the locations of releases of more than 650 toxic chemicals. No records of any toxic releases, hazardous waste, or other violations were found that would affect the site (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2006, State Water Resources Control Board 2006).

DTSC maintains a hazardous waste and substances site list (Cortese list) pursuant to Government Code Section 65962. As of October 2006, the project site is not on this list (DTSC 2006).

## **HAZARDS ASSOCIATED WITH MOSQUITOES**

Mosquitoes are blood-sucking insects whose biting habits can create irritating and unpleasant conditions for outdoor activities. In addition, some types of mosquitoes have the ability to transmit organisms that cause diseases in humans. All species of mosquitoes require standing water to complete their growth cycle; therefore, any body of standing water represents a potential mosquito breeding area. Water quality also affects the productivity of a potential mosquito breeding areas. Typically, greater numbers of mosquitoes are produced in water bodies with poor circulation, higher temperatures, and higher organic content (i.e., poor water quality) than in water bodies having good circulation, lower temperatures, and lower organic content. In addition, irrigation and flooding practices may influence the level of mosquito production associated with a water body. Typically, greater numbers of mosquitoes are produced in water bodies with water levels that slowly increase or recede than in water bodies with water levels that are stable or that rapidly fluctuate. Mosquito larvae prefer stagnant water and the protected microhabitats provided by stems of emergent vegetation (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1998).

In 1915, the California State Legislature enacted the Mosquito Abatement Act, which allowed local mosquito abatement organizations to form into specific special districts. Mosquito control in the United States has evolved from reliance on insecticide application for control of adult mosquitoes (adulticide) to integrated pest management programs that include surveillance, source reduction, larvicide, and biological control, as well as public relations

and education. Biological control includes use of many predators (dragonfly nymphs and other indigenous aquatic invertebrate predators such as predacious mosquitoes) that eat larvae and pupae; however, the most commonly used biological control adjuncts are mosquito fish. Mosquito fish are easily reared and therefore have become the most common supplemental biological control agent used in mosquito control.

The City is located within the Placer Mosquito Abatement District (MAD). Although Placer MAD was formed in 1996 by the Placer County Board of Supervisors, the district was not able to obtain funding (except in the City of Lincoln) until 2000, when a ballot measure was passed district-wide. The Placer MAD service area includes Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, Loomis, and the unincorporated areas west of Auburn (Placer County 2005).

Placer County mosquito technicians are certified by the California Department of Health Services in pesticide usage and mosquito and vector identification. The Placer MAD uses constant surveillance to locate mosquito breeding sources and to solve mosquito problems using physical, biological and chemical means along with public education (Placer County 2005).

In Placer County, mosquito abatement efforts are primarily focused on controlling mosquitoes that can transmit West Nile Virus. The spread of West Nile Virus has increased concern over mosquito abatement for the protection of wildlife, domestic animals, and humans. West Nile Virus is transmitted to humans and animals through a mosquito bite. In 2005, 34 confirmed cases of West Nile Virus were documented in Placer County (Placer County 2005).

## **FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE SERVICES**

Incident command and management responsibility at the scene of hazardous materials incidents within the City of Rocklin have been assigned to the Rocklin Fire Department (City of Rocklin Resolution No. 2004-226). All Rocklin Fire Department personnel have been trained to the First Responder Operational level. In addition, several personnel have been trained to the Hazardous Materials Specialist level. The Rocklin Fire Department is staffed with its own Mass Decontamination Response Team, which provides mutual aid support to Hazardous Materials Response Teams within Placer County and to surrounding areas. (Rocklin Fire Department 2006.)

Hazardous materials incidents, even minor ones, usually require a multi-agency response. The City of Roseville Fire Department and Placer County Interagency Hazardous Materials Response Teams provide mutual-aid response to the City, when requested.

According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's (CDF's) Fire Resource Assessment Program (FRAP), the project site is located in a "mixed interface" zone for wildland fires. These are areas where rural structures are adjacent to vast areas of vegetation, causing a greater threat of wildland fires during the fire season. The CDF also identifies wildland fire areas and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones for all counties in California. None of these areas or zones are located in the City (California Resources Agency 2003). However, areas north of the City are identified as High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and scattered areas in the western and northernmost part of Placer County are identified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. In addition, the City is not in a State Responsibility Area, which is defined as part of the state where the CDF is the primary service responsible for providing basic wildland fire protection assistance (CDF 1998).

### **4.8.2 REGULATORY SETTING**

#### **FEDERAL**

##### **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**

EPA is the agency primarily responsible for enforcement and implementation of federal laws and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials. Applicable federal regulations pertaining to hazardous materials are contained

mainly in CFR Titles 29, 40, and 49. Hazardous materials, as defined in the CFR (see “Definitions of Terms” above), are listed in 49 CFR 172.101. Management of hazardous materials is governed by the following laws:

- ▶ Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) (42 U.S. Code [USC] 6901 et seq.);
- ▶ Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA, also called the Superfund Act) (42 USC 9601 et seq.); and
- ▶ Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986 (Public Law 99–499).

These laws and associated regulations include specific requirements for facilities that generate, use, store, treat, and/or dispose of hazardous materials. EPA provides oversight and supervision for federal Superfund investigation/remediation projects, evaluates remediation technologies, and develops hazardous materials disposal restrictions and treatment standards.

### ***Hazardous Substances***

Hazardous substances are a subclass of hazardous materials. They are regulated under CERCLA and SARA (and the federal Clean Water Act for water resources). Under CERCLA, EPA has authority to seek the parties responsible for releases of hazardous substances and ensure their cooperation in site remediation. CERCLA also provides federal funding (the “Superfund”) for remediation. SARA Title III, the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act, requires companies to declare potential toxic hazards to ensure that local communities can plan for chemical emergencies. EPA maintains a National Priority List of uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites identified for priority remediation under the Superfund program. EPA also maintains the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) database, which contains information on hazardous waste sites, potential hazardous waste sites, and remedial activities across the nation.

### ***Hazardous Wastes***

Hazardous wastes, although included in the definition of hazardous materials and hazardous substances, are regulated separately under RCRA. A waste can legally be considered hazardous if it is classified as ignitable, corrosive, reactive, or toxic. Title 22, Section 66261.24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) (i.e., 22 CCR 66261.24) defines characteristics of toxicity. Under RCRA, EPA regulates hazardous waste from the time that the waste is generated until its final disposal (“cradle to grave”). RCRA also gives EPA or an authorized state the authority to conduct inspections to ensure that individual facilities are in compliance with regulations, and to pursue enforcement action if a violation is discovered. EPA can delegate its responsibility to a state if the state’s regulations are at least as stringent as the federal ones. RCRA was updated in 1984 by the passage of the federal Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments, which required phasing out land disposal of hazardous waste.

### ***Regulation of Pesticides***

The federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 USC 136 et seq.) provides federal control of pesticide distribution, sale, and use. EPA was given authority under FIFRA not only to study the consequences of pesticide usage but also to require users (farmers, utility companies, and others) to register when purchasing pesticides. Later amendments to the law required users to take exams for certification as applicators of pesticides. All pesticides used in the United States must be registered (licensed) by EPA. Registration assures that pesticides will be properly labeled and that if used in accordance with specifications, they will not cause unreasonable harm to the environment.

## **Regulation of Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCBs)**

The Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 (15 USC 2605) banned the manufacture, processing, distribution, and use of PCBs in totally enclosed systems. PCBs are considered hazardous materials because of their toxicity; they have been shown to cause cancer in animals, along with effects on the immune, reproductive, nervous, and endocrine systems, and studies have shown evidence of similar effects in humans (EPA 2004). The EPA Region 9 PCB Program regulates remediation of PCBs in several states, including California. 40 CFR Section 761.30(a)(1)(vi)(A) states that all owners of electrical transformers containing PCBs must register their transformers with EPA. 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” (Section 761.40[g]). Transformers and other items manufactured before July 1, 1978, containing PCBs must be marked as such.

## **U.S. Department of Transportation**

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), in conjunction with EPA, is responsible for enforcement and implementation of federal laws and regulations pertaining to transportation of hazardous materials. The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act of 1974 (49 USC 5101 et seq.) directs DOT to establish criteria and regulations regarding safe storage and transportation of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials regulations are contained in 49 CFR 171–180, and address transportation of hazardous materials, types of materials defined as hazardous, and the marking of vehicles transporting hazardous materials. In particular, 49 CFR 173, titled “Shippers’ General Requirements for Shipments and Packagings,” defines hazardous materials for transportation purposes; within this portion of the code, 49 CFR 173.3 provides specific packaging requirements for shipment of hazardous materials, and 49 CFR 173.21 lists categories of materials and packages that are forbidden for shipping. 49 CFR 177, titled “Carriage by Public Highway,” defines unacceptable hazardous materials shipments.

## **Occupational Health and Safety Administration**

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) of the U.S. Department of Labor is responsible for enforcement and implementation of federal laws and regulations pertaining to worker health and safety. Workers at hazardous waste sites must receive specialized training and medical supervision according to the Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) regulations (29 CFR 1910.120).

## **STATE**

### **California Environmental Protection Agency**

The DTSC, a division of Cal/EPA, has primary regulatory responsibility over hazardous materials in California, working in conjunction with the federal EPA to enforce and implement hazardous materials laws and regulations. DTSC can delegate enforcement responsibilities to local jurisdictions.

The hazardous waste management program enforced by DTSC was created by the Hazardous Waste Control Act (California Health and Safety Code Section 25100 et seq.), which is implemented by regulations described in CCR Title 26. The State program thus created is similar to, but more stringent than, the federal program under RCRA. The regulations list materials that may be hazardous and establish criteria for their identification, packaging, and disposal.

Environmental health standards for management of hazardous waste are contained in CCR Title 22, Division 4.5. In addition, as required by California Government Code Section 65962.5, DTSC maintains a Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List for the state, commonly called the Cortese List. The project site is not included on this list (DTSC 2006).

California’s Secretary for Environmental Protection has established a unified hazardous waste and hazardous materials management regulatory program (Unified Program) as required by Senate Bill 1082 (1993). The Unified

Program consolidates, coordinates, and makes consistent the administrative requirements, permits, inspections, and enforcement activities for the following environmental programs:

- ▶ hazardous waste generator and hazardous waste on-site treatment programs;
- ▶ Underground Storage Tank program,
- ▶ hazardous materials release response plans and inventories;
- ▶ California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARPP);
- ▶ Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act requirements for spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plans; and
- ▶ California Uniform Fire Code (UFC) hazardous material management plans and inventories.

The six environmental programs within the Unified Program are implemented at the local level by local agencies—Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPAs). CUPAs carry out the responsibilities previously handled by approximately 1,300 State and local agencies, providing a central permitting and regulatory agency for permits, reporting, and compliance enforcement (California Resources Agency 2003). The Placer County Environmental Health Department is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Placer County. The Placer County Environmental Health Department's service area includes both unincorporated areas and incorporated cities, excluding the City of Roseville.

### **State Water Resources Control Board**

The SWRCB has primary responsibility to protect water quality and supply. The Rocklin Crossings site is located within the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). As described in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, the RWQCB is authorized by the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1969 to protect the waters of the state. The RWQCB provides oversight for sites where the quality of groundwater or surface waters is threatened. Extraction and disposal of contaminated groundwater due to investigation/remediation activities or due to dewatering during construction would require a permit from the RWQCB if the water were discharged to storm drains, surface water, or land.

### **California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Health Administration**

The California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA), assumes primary responsibility for developing and enforcing workplace safety regulations within the state. Cal/OSHA standards are more stringent than federal OSHA regulations, and are presented in CCR Title 8. Standards for workers dealing with hazardous materials include practices for all industries (General Industry Safety Orders); specific practices are described for construction, and hazardous waste operations and emergency response. Cal/OSHA conducts on-site evaluations and issues notices of violation to enforce necessary improvements to health and safety practices.

### **California Office of Emergency Services**

The California Office of Emergency Services (OES) issued the State of California Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan) (California Office of Emergency Services 2004) in September 2004. The federal Disaster Mitigation Act required all state emergency services agencies to issue such plans by November 1, 2004, for the states to receive federal grant funds for disaster assistance and mitigation under the Stafford Act (44 CFR 201.4). The overall intent of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan is to reduce or prevent injury and damage from natural hazards in California, such as earthquakes, wildfires, and flooding. The plan identifies past and present hazard mitigation activities, current policies and programs, and mitigation goals, objectives, and strategies for the future (California Office of Emergency Services 2004).

### **California Department of Transportation and California Highway Patrol**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and California Highway Patrol (CHP) enforce and monitor U.S. Department of Transportation hazardous materials and waste transportation laws and regulations in



California. Together, these agencies determine container types used and license hazardous waste haulers for hazardous waste transportation on public roads. All motor carriers and drivers involved in transportation of hazardous materials must apply for and obtain a hazardous materials transportation license from CHP. When transporting explosives, inhalation hazards, and highway route-controlled quantities of radioactive materials, safe routing and safe stopping-places are required, as described in 26 CCR, Section 13 et seq. A route map must be carried in the vehicle.

## LOCAL

### City of Rocklin General Plan

The following goals and policies from the Community Safety Element of the City General Plan (1991) are applicable to the proposed project:

- ▶ **Goal:** To minimize the danger of natural and man-made hazards and to protect residents and visitors from the danger of earthquake, fire, flood, other natural disasters, and man-made dangers
  - **Policy 9:** To require disclosure of hazardous materials by those using them within the City, or proposing to use them in new industrial or commercial activities, in accordance with Placer County guidelines and the requirements of State Law.
  - **Policy 10:** To enforce the City building code, fire code, and City ordinances in regard to fire safety and fire protection.
  - **Policy 15:** To encourage residential development to locate within approximately two road miles from a fire station, and to encourage high density commercial development to be located approximately one and one-half road miles from a fire station, unless special fire suppression measures are incorporated into the development.
  - **Policy 16:** To require projects to be designed with at least two points of access for emergency vehicles or for general circulation where such access is necessary to assure adequate egress and ingress.

### Rocklin Municipal Code Title 2, Administration and Personnel

Chapter 2.32 of the Rocklin Municipal Code requires the development of emergency procedures in the City through the Emergency Operations Plan. The Emergency Operations Plan provides a framework to guide the City's efforts to mitigate and prepare for, respond to, and recover from major emergencies or disasters.

To implement the Emergency Operations Plan, the City has established a Disaster Council, which is responsible for reviewing and recommending emergency operations plans for adoption by the City Council. The Disaster Council plans for the protection of persons and property in the event of fires, floods, storms, epidemic, riot, earthquake and other disasters.

## 4.8.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### METHOD OF ANALYSIS

This analysis considers the range and nature of foreseeable hazardous materials use, storage, and disposal resulting from the proposed project and identifies the primary ways that these hazardous materials could expose individuals or the environment to health and safety risks. Local and State agencies would be expected to continue to enforce applicable requirements to the extent that they do so now.

The following reports documenting potential hazardous conditions at the project site were reviewed for this analysis:

- ▶ Land use plans for the proposed project;
- ▶ Available literature, including documents published by city, county, State, and federal agencies;
- ▶ Applicable elements from the City General Plan; and,
- ▶ Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Phase II Soils Sampling and Testing Program, Rocklin 105 – Wymore Parcels, prepared by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates (2005).

The information obtained from these sources was reviewed and summarized to establish existing conditions and to identify potential environmental effects, based on the standards of significance presented in this section. In determining the level of significance, the analysis assumes that development in the project area would comply with relevant federal, State, and local ordinances and regulations.

### **THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a public health and hazards impact is considered significant if implementation of the proposed project would do any of the following:

- ▶ 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 or through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- ▶ result in safety hazards to people residing or working in the project area;
- ▶ emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- ▶ be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment;
- ▶ be located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a public airstrip, such that a safety hazard would result for people residing or working in the project area;
- ▶ impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or,
- ▶ 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.

No schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site and the project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or private airport. As such, no safety hazards related to schools or airports are anticipated. Also, the project is not anticipated to affect emergency response plans because emergency response vehicles would have direct access to the site from Interstate 80 and Sierra College Boulevard, the City's Police and Fire Departments would review the site design and circulation layout as part of the City's project referral process to ensure adequate emergency access is provided, and fire suppression infrastructure (e.g., fire hydrants, building sprinklers) would be incorporated into the site design in order to minimize fire hazards, consistent with City requirements. These issue areas will not be evaluated further in this Draft EIR.

## IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**IMPACT 4.8-1** Exposure to Known and Unknown Hazardous Materials. *No recognized environmental conditions have been identified to date on the project site. However, excavation and construction activities in the area could result in the exposure of construction workers and the general public to hazardous materials, including petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers; contaminated debris; elevated levels of chemicals that could be hazardous; or hazardous substances that could be inadvertently spilled or otherwise spread. This impact is considered **significant**.*

The site reconnaissance and records search conducted for the Phase I ESA did not find documentation or physical evidence of recognized environmental conditions in soil or groundwater associated with the use of the proposed project site. A 550-gallon UST was located on the Takuma homestead and was removed in December 2004, which was observed by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates. No residual contamination was documented following its removal.

A Phase II soils sampling and testing program was conducted concurrently with the Phase I ESA to evaluate fill soil located east of the former rural residential site for metals and potential agricultural chemical residuals, and to address the potential for concentrations of persistent pesticides resulting from the site's historic agricultural uses. The soil analysis conducted by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates determined that detected metals concentrations and organochlorine compounds in the majority of the soil samples were well below their EPA health-based PRG values and metals concentrations are also generally consistent with or lower than the median, naturally occurring background metals concentrations in soil.

Per the 2005 Wallace-Kuhl & Associates Phase 1 ESA, several pole-mounted electrical transformers and one concrete-pad mounted transformer exist on the site. However, as a part of the recently initiated Interstate 80/Sierra College Boulevard Interchange Improvement Project, the pad mounted transformer and several pole mounted transformers were relocated off of the project site, but one pole mounted transformer still exists on the project site. The pole mounted transformer on the project site is not tagged on the exterior to signify that it does not contain PCB, and is therefore of unknown PCB content. No obvious evidence of transformer leakage beneath or around the transformers was observed during the Phase I ESA.

A review of regulatory agency lists identified one potential state Superfund site, Forest Products Manufacturing, located more than one-half mile west of the project site. The Forest Products Manufacturing site was satisfactorily remediated in 1993 under DTSC oversight. Three facilities registered for use and/or storage of reportable quantities of hazardous materials, including USTs, are located within one-half mile of the project site (Unocal, 7-Eleven Convenience Store, and Highbridge Ranch). MtBE has been identified in on-site soils at the 7-Eleven Convenience Store and the site is currently undergoing a preliminary site assessment. There are no records of hazardous materials releases from USTs at Highbridge Ranch.

The former Takuma Japanese homestead site likely had a water supply well, and both the former homestead site and the former rural residential site were likely connected to individual septic systems. However, no evidence of a well or septic systems was observed by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates. If during development of the project site, a water supply well or septic systems are uncovered, removal may be required. If this action is necessary, the well and/or septic systems would be required to be removed and filled in accordance with applicable State and local regulations, as directed by the Placer County Department of Environmental Health.

Development of the project would involve site grading, excavation for utilities, trenching, backfilling, and the construction of proposed facilities that could result in the exposure of construction workers and the general public to hazardous materials, including petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers; contaminated debris; elevated levels of chemicals that could be hazardous; or hazardous substances that could be inadvertently spilled or otherwise spread. Excavation would also be necessary off of the site for utility extensions, primarily related to water line extensions, within roadway right-of-ways, and for the detention basin construction. Any on-

site structures that require removal could include asbestos-containing building materials and lead-containing materials (e.g., paint, sealants, pipe solder), which could become friable or mobile during demolition activities and come into contact with construction workers. Excavation and construction activities could also expose construction workers and the general public to currently unknown hazardous materials. If the proposed Rocklin 60 residential development project is constructed and occupied prior to the proposed project construction, it would increase the potential for public exposure to these hazardous materials by increasing the number of people in the local area. Because the release of hazardous materials into the environment could result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, this impact would be **significant**.

#### Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 Exposure to Known and Unknown Hazardous Materials

- a. If during site preparation and construction activities previous undiscovered or unknown evidence of hazardous materials contamination is observed or suspected through either obvious or implied measures (e.g., stained or odorous soil, unknown storage tanks, etc.), construction activities shall immediately cease in the area of the find.

Placer County Environmental Health Department staff shall be immediately consulted and the project applicant shall contract with a qualified consultant registered in DTSC's Registered Environmental Assessor Program to assess the situation. If necessary, risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent. Any required remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Work Plan or equivalent. Based on consultation between the Registered Environmental Assessor and DTSC, remediation of the site shall be conducted consistent with all applicable regulations.

- b. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall provide to the City of Rocklin an assessment conducted by or on behalf of PG&E pertaining to the contents of the existing pole mounted transformers located on and nearby the project site. The assessment shall determine whether the existing pole mounted transformer on the site and the pole mounted transformers adjacent to the site contain PCBs and whether there are any records of spills from such equipment. If PCB-containing equipment is identified, the maintenance and/or disposal of the transformers shall be subject to the regulations of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) under the authority of the Placer County Environmental Health Department. If the electrical transformers are determined not to contain PCBs, they shall be labeled as such and no further mitigation shall be required.

#### Level of Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce potential hazards associated with exposure to known or unknown contaminated soil or other hazardous materials by identifying the necessary procedures to follow if materials are discovered. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**IMPACT 4.8-2** *Exposure to Hazardous Materials during Project Construction. Use of various paints, solvents, cements, glues, and fuels is expected during construction of the proposed project. Construction workers could be exposed to hazardous materials as a result of improper handling or use; accident; environmentally unsound disposal methods; or fire, explosion, or other emergencies, resulting in adverse health effects. However, all allowable uses would be subject to compliance with federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations, and would be monitored by the state (e.g., Cal/OSHA, DTSC, CHP) and/or local jurisdictions. Therefore, the potential for human exposure to hazardous materials during construction would be considered a less-than-significant impact.*

Hazardous materials would be used in varying amounts during construction of the proposed project. Construction and maintenance activities would use hazardous materials, such as fuels (gasoline and diesel); oils and lubricants; paints and paint thinners; and glues; cleaners (which could include solvents and corrosives in addition to soaps

and detergents). Construction workers and the general public could be exposed to hazards and hazardous materials as a result of improper handling or use during construction activities (particularly by untrained personnel); transportation accidents; or fires, explosions, or other emergencies. Construction workers could also be exposed to hazards associated with accidental releases of hazardous materials, which could result in adverse health effects. If the proposed Rocklin 60 residential development project is constructed and occupied prior to the proposed project construction, it would increase the potential for public exposure to these hazardous materials by increasing the number of people in the local area.

The proposed project would be required to comply with regulations on the transportation of hazardous materials codified in 49 CFR 173 and 49 CFR 177 and CCR Title 26, Division 6. These regulations, which are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the CHP, provide specific packaging requirements, define unacceptable hazardous materials shipments, and prescribe safe-transit practices by carriers of hazardous materials. Compliance with these regulations would reduce the risk of exposure to humans and the environment related to the transportation of hazardous materials.

Hazardous materials regulations, which are codified in CCR Titles 8 and 22, and their enabling legislation set forth in Chapter 6.5 (Section 25100 et seq.) of the California Health and Safety Code, were established at the State level to ensure compliance with federal regulations to reduce the risk to human health and the environment from the routine use of hazardous substances. Construction specifications would include the following requirements in compliance with applicable regulations and codes, including, but not limited to CCR Titles 8 and 22, Uniform Fire Code, and Division 20 of the California Health and Safety Code: all reserve fuel supplies and hazardous materials must be stored within the confines of a designated construction area; equipment refueling and maintenance must take place only within the staging area; and construction vehicles shall be inspected daily for leaks. Off-site activities (e.g., utility construction) would also be required to comply with these regulations. These regulations and codes must be implemented, as appropriate, and are monitored by the State and/or local jurisdictions, including the Placer County Environmental Health Department and the Rocklin Fire Department.

Contractors would be required to comply with Cal/EPA's Unified Program; regulated activities would be managed by Placer County Environmental Health Department, the designated Certified Unified Program Agency for Placer County, in accordance with the regulations included in the Unified Program (e.g., hazardous materials release response plans and inventories, California UFC hazardous material management plans and inventories). Such compliance would reduce the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials during construction of the proposed project. As a result, it would lessen the risk of exposure of construction workers and the public to accidental release of hazardous materials, as well as the demand for incident emergency response.

Compliance with federal, State, and local hazardous materials regulations and codes, would reduce to a **less-than-significant** level impacts related to hazards for construction workers and the general public involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazards materials.

#### Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 Exposure to Hazardous Materials during Project Construction

No mitigation measures would be necessary.

#### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Exposure of construction workers and the general public to hazardous materials during construction would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

**IMPACT**     **Exposure to Hazardous Materials during Project Operations.** *The proposed project would use many materials, some of which are considered hazardous, during the course of its daily operations. Compliance with federal, State, and local hazardous materials regulations, which would be monitored by the State and/or local jurisdictions, would reduce impacts associated with the use, transport, and storage of hazardous materials during operation of the project. Therefore, impacts related to creation of significant hazards to the public or the environment would be **less than significant**.*

4.8-3

The proposed project is a regional shopping center with a wide variety of retail uses, including two major tenants (presently expected to be Wal-Mart Supercenter and Home Depot), as well as several smaller retail and restaurant-type uses, and potentially additional traveler-serving uses. The proposed project would use many materials, some of which are considered hazardous, during the course of its daily operations. Employees and the general public could be exposed to hazardous materials as a result of improper handling or use; transportation accidents; environmentally unsound disposal methods; or fire, explosion, or other emergencies, resulting in adverse health effects. If the proposed Rocklin 60 residential development project is constructed and occupied, it would increase the potential for public exposure to these hazardous materials by increasing the number of people in the local area.

As with construction, operation of the proposed project is required to be consistent with federal, State, and local laws and regulations addressing hazardous materials management and environmental protection, including, but not limited to 49 CFR 173 and 177, and CCR Title 26, Division 6 for transportation of hazardous materials, and CCR Titles 8 and 22, Uniform Fire Code, and Division 20 of the California Health and Safety Code for routine use of hazardous materials. These regulations and codes must be implemented, as appropriate, and are monitored by the State and/or local jurisdictions, including Caltrans, the CHP, the Placer County Environmental Health Department, and the Rocklin Fire Department.

The Placer County Environmental Health Department, as the local Certified Unified Program Agency, oversees hazardous materials registrations, underground storage tank programs, aboveground petroleum storage tank spill prevention control and countermeasure plans, risk management plans, and some fire safety planning. Additionally, businesses are regulated as employers by Cal/OSHA and are therefore required to ensure employee safety. Specific requirements include identifying hazardous materials in the workplace, providing safety information to workers that handle hazardous materials, and adequately training workers.

The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to safe-transit practices, workplace safety, spill prevention, and other hazardous materials-related concerns. The Placer County Environmental Health Department and the Rocklin Fire Department, and other agencies would be required to enforce compliance, including issuing permits and tracking and inspections of hazardous materials transportation and storage. As a result, operation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the general public or the environment involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

#### **Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 Exposure to Hazardous Materials during Project Operations**

No mitigation measures would be necessary.

#### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Exposure of site employees and the general public to hazardous materials during project operations would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

**IMPACT 4.8-4** **Potential for Public Health Hazards from Mosquitoes.** *The proposed project would include a detention basin, which could attract mosquitoes and other water-borne vectors, thereby potentially creating a public health hazard. The detention basin would be designed to not retain storm water for long periods. Therefore, it would not create a location that would facilitate mosquito breeding. This impact would be less than significant.*

Hazards to public health could result from project features that could perpetuate mosquito populations. The project proposes the use of a stormwater detention basin that would be operated in conjunction with the proposed Rocklin 60 residential development. The stormwater detention basin would discharge to an existing swale connected to Secret Ravine. The detention basin would be designed to not retain storm water for long periods and, therefore, would not be expected to facilitate mosquito breeding. However, the existing swale could provide a potential mosquito breeding site if shallow standing water is present. The ongoing mosquito abatement activities by the Placer Mosquito Abatement District, which include constant surveillance to locate mosquito breeding sources and to solve mosquito problems using physical, biological, and chemical means along with public education, are expected to effectively control mosquito breeding areas adjacent to the project site, including those that may be present in the existing swale. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area related to the exposure to health risks associated with mosquitoes. This impact would be **less than significant**.

#### Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 Potential for Public Health Hazards from Mosquitoes

No mitigation measures would be necessary.

#### Level of Significance After Mitigation

The potential public health hazards associated with mosquito exposure would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

**IMPACT 4.8-5** **Exposure of People or Structures to Wildland Fires.** *The project site is not located in a designated wildland fire area, a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, or a State Responsibility Area. In addition, the project applicant would be required to incorporate Uniform Fire Code requirements into the project designs and operations. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires. This impact would be less than significant.*

The project site is not located in a designated wildland fire area, a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, or a State Responsibility Area. However, development of the project site would introduce commercial land uses into a “mixed interface zone,” as defined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection’s Fire Resource Assessment Program. Mixed interface zones are areas where rural structures are adjacent to open areas of vegetation, which results in an increased hazard from wildland fires because of the close proximity of urban development to wildland areas.

The project would substantially alter the rural landscape of this mixed interface zone by completely removing site vegetation and building upon or paving the majority of the site. In addition, masonry walls would be constructed along the eastern perimeter of the site, which would form an effective fire barrier between the undeveloped lands to the east and the proposed project. In addition, if the proposed Rocklin 60 residential development is constructed along the project’s eastern boundary, it would provide an additional barrier between the naturally vegetated landscape to the east and the project site. The remainder of the site would be surrounded by paved roads, which would act as a fire break.

The Rocklin Fire Department responds to wildland fires within the City limits and has indicated that the department has no wildland fire concerns regarding the proposed project (Petitclerc 2005). The project applicant

would be required to incorporate Uniform Fire Code requirements into the project designs and operations. A water system capable of delivering required fire flows would be required to be provided in accordance with the Uniform Fire Code and the project design includes three points of access for emergency vehicles, which ensures adequate ingress and egress. Therefore, the project would not be expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. This impact would be **less than significant**.

#### Mitigation Measure 4.8-5 Exposure of People or Structures to Wildfire Fires.

No mitigation measures would be necessary.

#### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

The project's potential exposure to wildland fire risks would be considered a less-than-significant impact.